LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.
BX 5115 .H37 1855
Hare, Julius Charles, 1795-1855.
Miscellaneous pamphlets on some of the leading

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/miscellaneouspam00hare

The Works

OF

JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES;
RECTOR OF HERSTMONCEUX; CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN; AND
FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

UNIFORMLY PRINTED AND BOUND IN CLOTH.

I.

CHARGES TO THE CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LEWES,

Delivered at the ORDINARY VISITATIONS from the year 1840 to 1854, with Notes on the Principal Events affecting the Church during that period. Collected and completed. With an INTRODUCTION explanatory of his position in the Church with reference to the parties that divide it. In Three Vols. 8vo. cloth.

As only a very small Edition has been made, an early application is requested.

II.

CHARGES TO THE CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF LEWES,

Delivered at the ORDINARY VISITATIONS in the years 1843—1845, 1846. Never before Published. With an Introduction. 8vo. cloth.

"These three Charges are included in the Collected Edition."

THE WORKS OF JULIUS CHARLES HARE, B.D.

III.

MISCELLANEOUS PAMPHLETS

On some of the LEADING QUESTIONS agitated in the CHURCH during the last Ten Years. 8vo. cloth, 12*s*.

As only a very small Edition of the Collected Pamphlets has been made up, an early application is requested.

IV.

A Second Edition of

THE VICTORY OF FAITH.

8vo. cloth, 5*s*.

V.

A Second Edition of

THE MISSION OF THE COMFORTER.

With Notes. 8vo. cloth, 12*s*.

VI.

A Second Edition of

VINDICATION OF LUTHER FROM HIS ENGLISH ASSAILANTS.

8vo. cloth, 7*s*.

VII.

THE CONTEST WITH ROME.

A CHARGE to the CLERGY of the ARCHDEACONRY of LEWES, delivered at the Ordinary Visitation in 1831. With Notes especially in answer to Dr. Newman's recent Lectures. 8vo. cloth, 10*s*. 6*d*.

MISCELLANEOUS PAMPHLETS.

PRINTED BY R. CLAY, LONDON,

FOR

MACMILLAN AND CO. CAMBRIDGE.

London: BELL AND DALDY, 186, FLEET STREET.
Dublin: W. ROBERTSON.
Edinburgh: EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.
Glasgow: JAMES MACLEHOSE.
Oxford: J. H. & JAS. PARKER.

MISCELLANEOUS PAMPHLETS

ON SOME OF

THE LEADING QUESTIONS

AGITATED IN THE CHURCH DURING THE LAST

TEN YEARS.

BY

JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.

RECTOR OF HERSTMONCEUX;

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES; CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN.

Cambridge:

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1855.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH:

A SERMON,

WITH INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON UNIFORMITY.

1845.

CONTENTS.

I.

The Unity of the Church: a Sermon, with Introductory Remarks on Uniformity. 1845.

II.

Letter to the Dean of Chichester, on the Appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford: Second Edition, with a Postscript, on Lord John Russell's Letter to the Clergy of Bedford, and in reply to Mr. Trower's Plain Remarks. 1848.

III.

Thou shalt not bear False Witness against thy Neighbour: a Letter to the Editor of the English Review: with a Letter from Professor Maurice to the Author. 1849.

IV.

Letter to the Hon. R. Cavendish, on the recent Judgment of the Court of Appeal, as affecting the Doctrine of the Church: Second Edition, with a Postscript. 1850.

V.

A Few Words on the Rejection of the Episcopal Bill to Amend the Ecclesiastical Court of Appeal. 1850.

VI.

The Unity of Mankind in God: a Sermon preached on Occasion of the Jubilee of the Church Missionary Society. 1848.

VII.

Education the Necessity of Mankind: a Sermon preached at the Laying of a Foundation Stone for a School for the Middle Classes. 1851.

PREFACE.

This Sermon, with the Dedication which precedes it, has been in print this year and a half, as part of a volume, the publication of which has been delayed by a variety of causes. Its appearance by itself at present is occasioned by the advice of some friends, for whose wisdom I am bound to feel the highest reverence, and who have thought it might be of service in helping to allay the calamitous dissensions in our Church.

The rock on which we are splitting now, as we have been again and again, ever since our Church asserted her national independence at the Reformation, is the notion that the only way of preserving the Unity of the Church is by enforcing a rigid Uniformity. This notion has been maintained with a singular consistency and pertinacity by the chief part of the persons who have been called to exercise authority in our Church during the last three centuries; and the recent agitation has shewn how widely it is spread at this day. Were a judgement formed from the opinions which have found vent on this occasion, on whatsoever side, and from whatsoever position, at least among the clergy, it would seem to be held by all as an uncontroverted and incontrovertible truth, a truth so plain and self-evident as to need no argument for its demonstration; which in one point of view is lucky for it, as assuredly it is indemonstrable. Yet, so far is it from being a universal

truth, or even an opinion to which man is universally led by the tendencies of his nature, that the English branch of the Church since the Reformation is the one sole portion of the whole Church, which has brought this notion prominently forward as the regulative principle of her policy. The wiser principle of the universal Church, the principle which she has recognized speculatively, and which she has in great measure desired to realize practically, is that expressed in the celebrated threefold maxim, *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas:* and this is in exact accordance with the spirit of the Apostolic Epistles, to which our rigid enforcement of uniformity is utterly repugnant. Even the Church of Rome, in those ages when she was most imperiously wielding her usurpt dominion over Western Christendom, being ever largely endowed with the wisdom of the serpent,—a wisdom which indeed seems almost natural to the Italian intellect,—acted far more judiciously than we have done in this respect. Though she oppressively curtailed the *libertas*, which ought to have been allowed in doubtful things, she was too sagacious not to discern that the multitudinous combinations of the elements of human nature are not, all and each, to be shaped in a single mould, but require a multiplicity of institutions, and divers modes of training, and divers spheres to act in, if the powers dormant in them are to be drawn forth for their own good and that of the community. And with reference to our immediate subject, we are told in the Preface to our Common Prayer, that "heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm; some following Salisbury Use, some Hereford Use, and some the Use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln."

It would seem owing to that want of any distinctive religious principle, and that spirit of compromise, which characterize our Reformation, that, inasmuch as there was no one mighty inward power, which might have formed a living source of unity, our ecclesiastical rulers fancied themselves compelled to impose some uniting bond from without. The actuating idea of our Reformation, the idea which exercised the chief influence in determining the course of events, being the nationality of our Church, and its consequent independence of all forein dominion, far more stress was laid in England, than in the other countries which vindicated their Christian liberty at the Reformation, on the union between the Church and the State. Thus the State came to act a principal part in regulating the concerns of the Church; and the ordinary mode in which the State acts is by Law. But Law is essentially rigid and compulsory; wherefore its appropriate office is vetative and prohibitive. This very rigidity unfits it for such delicate tasks as that of propagating and nurturing and shaping anything so tender and variable and multiform as life, above all, religious life. It should be content with its twofold work, that of repressing evil, and thereby fencing in and protecting the ground on which good is to grow. Hence, as Law makes no distinctions, and as the Liturgy was to be imposed by Law, it could not but happen, even without any excessive arbitrariness on the part of the legislators, that the Act by which the Liturgy was imposed became an Act of Uniformity. Moreover the Government, sharing in the common proneness of mankind to invert the right order of things, and to fancy that the heart and the will are to be moulded and controlled by outward force, deemed that, if it could ensure the submission of its

subjects to one prescribed form of worship, it should thereby secure their obedience and allegiance. At all events the notion of the indispensableness of Uniformity became more and more firmly establisht, until in the succeeding century it produced the most disastrous results: and yet even these did not avail to root it out of our Church.

That this notion is utterly groundless and delusive, I have endeavoured to shew in the Dedication prefixt to the following Sermon, not of course in the form of a systematic treatise, but following the line pointed out by the passage cited from the Charge of my most dear and honoured brother Archdeacon. The arguments brought forward might indeed be greatly strengthened; and with many they might carry more weight, if they were propt with a greater number of authorities: but when my cause is supported by the whole order of Nature, by the whole course of History, by Bacon, and by St Paul, I will not fear to incur the charge of presumption, though a thousand or ten thousand second and third-rate men should be summoned into court against me.

But though the question was discust without reference to the present disputes, it was not without a direct practical object. For in the discharge of my official duties I had several times been distrest by symptoms of a restless craving after uniformity in petty things; and I was afraid that this craving might lead to idle and vexatious bickerings. It was chiefly however from among the inferior Clergy that I apprehended such evils. I could not anticipate, more especially after the sad consequences which had ensued from a very cautious and temperate attempt to recommend ritual uniformity, that any person invested with authority in our Church, would risk her peace by

trying peremptorily to enforce what in itself is worthless, and cannot be enforced without vehement opposition. With my strong convictions on the subject, it is not to be wondered at that the very first announcement of this effort filled me with dread, and that I exclaimed that, if it were persisted in, it would probably drive three fourths of the Diocese into the arms of Dissent: and somewhat similar views, I found, were entertained by all the most judicious persons with whom I had the opportunity of conversing. Alas! our forebodings have been too rapidly and dismally justified. An angry, jealous spirit has been called up, which it will not be easy to lay; and among the miserable effects of this ill-fated measure, one is, that our rites and ceremonies are become a matter for ceaseless loquacious jangling with those who pour out their spleen and ignorance and impertinence into the sink of the daily press. They are the subject of idle disputatious talk at every breakfast-table, and in every pothouse; dissenters laugh in scornful triumph; and what can the dutiful son of the Church of England do, but mourn?

This disastrous controversy is, for the moment at least, one of the worst checks that has befallen the Church in our times; and it threatens to arrest the progress of the improvements which were gradually and not slowly spreading. A cry, almost a yell, has been set up by the lovers of anile torpour, and by those who are fond of letting the dust and cobwebs, which they would sweep out of their parlours, accumulate in their pews, to the effect that every change which has been made in the last ten or twenty years, must immediately be reverst, and that we must return to the decent quiet worship of the good old times. With this clamour, I trust, few will comply, none without strong

justifying cause. For let us not be deluded by an empty rigmarole phrase: let us say plainly, The old times referred to, generally speaking, with regard to the mode of carrying on the worship in our churches, were not good, but bad. Laxity, carelessness, irregularity were lamentably prevalent in the latter half of the last and the early part of this century: and even where things were in a better case, the other offices of the Church were often scarcely esteemed as more than subordinate preludes to the sermon. I will not dwell here on this matter; but I will add, on the strength of my own observation, confirmed by the evidence of every person with whom I have spoken on the subject, that great improvements, improvements acknowledged to be such by all the respectable members of the congregation, have been effected in this respect in a number of parishes within the last ten or twenty years. In proof of this let me cite the following statement from the Charge which the excellent Bishop of Salisbury delivered at his Visitation in 1842. Few things that I have read of late years, bearing on the condition of our Church, have seemed to me so cheering. "In this Diocese there are now two services on the Sunday in forty-two parishes, in which there was only single duty at my last Visitation; in sixty-five parishes, in which there was only one sermon, there are now every Sunday either two sermons, or,—what in country parishes is perhaps better,—instruction is given at one of the services catechetically, or by a lecture upon some portion of Scripture; the sacrament of Baptism is administered publicly during divine service, either always, or on certain definite occasions, in eighty-nine parishes, in which this used not to be the case; in many parishes the Holy Communion is celebrated much more frequently than formerly.

the administration of it occurring six, eight, or ten times a-year, or in many of the larger parishes, and in some even of the smaller villages, once in every month; there is an increasing sense of the propriety of distinguishing by their proper services at least the more important seasons of peculiar solemnity in the Church,—Ascension Day and Ash-Wednesday I may name as instances of days till of late, strange to say, almost universally neglected, and now, I trust, in the way of being before long universally observed; while in no inconsiderable number of parishes all the days specially appointed by the Church to be kept holy are markt by their appropriate services, and in some the full order of the Church in the daily service is maintained. I find too that in many quarters increasing efforts are being made to effect that most important as well as difficult object, the retaining the younger members of our flocks under the influence of religious instruction beyond that age, unhappily almost always a very tender age, at which they quit the daily school." The Bishop adds, "In some of the matters to which I have referred, I have been rather stating facts than giving advice; as I much prefer that changes, which must be deemed more or less experimental, should originate from the free will of those who are convinced of their advantage, rather than from any suggestions given by myself. Nor indeed am I prepared in my own judgement to lay down any rule in some of these points as of universal application." And he fully acknowledges that even these "are but the forms of godliness," and that, without the spirit of holiness, they may be merely "the savour of death unto death." Still we may reasonably cherish a hope that, when such improvements are made, and activity of this kind is increasing, the Spirit of Grace

will bless the work. At all events the passage shews that, where the work of improvement is carried on in the right method, not by a summary edict, but with a considerate adaptation to the wants of each particular parish, and where the alterations relate, not to frivolous externals of posture and vestment, which it is ever a stumblingblock to the pious and simplehearted to see raised into significance, but to matters of plain practical utility and expediency, such as may be recognized by the better part of the congregation, who always on the long run exercise the chief influence in it, a great deal may be accomplisht by quiet, unobtrusive, judicious perseverance even in the space of three years. And a like encouragement, as well as warning, is held out to us by the whole history of our Church. When its rulers desire to exert their authority for the furtherance of that which is felt to be morally and spiritually good, the hearts of men, as it were, leap up to meet them, and answer them readily and joyfully: but when the anxiety is only displayed for the upholding of outward unmeaning forms, this very anxiety gives offense, as having a savour of superstition; and the hearts of men recoil and resist.

At present a multitude of voices from all quarters are calling somewhat impatiently for a settlement of the questions which are disturbing the Church. Similar demands have found utterance every now and then for some years past; but they are now become louder and more frequent. Well, what do they mean? The unhappy issue of the attempts which have already been made to bring some of our minor differences to a settlement, proves that the demanders in point of fact want to have everything settled in their own way. However much they may differ from

each other, they join in this, every one desiring to have his own will, his own notions, his own fancies, set up as the law of the Church. If they can gain this one pet point, it matters not how, whether by persons possessing a rightful authority, or by persons who have none, whether by a Convocation, by a Synod of Bishops, by the Queen in Council, by an Ecclesiastical Commission, by an Act of Parliament, or by the suffrages of the people. Even the Pope would be tolerated, if he would consent to echo the wishes of the Pope within each man's breast. But let us ask a further question. To what end are these differences to be settled? In order that we may be at peace. Doubtless many a self-constituted legislator, when the winds are rushing along in their fury, or the waves are roaring and dashing beneath the violence of the storm, would gladly call in some charmer to lull them to rest. Many have thought that the world would be much happier and better, if the winds and waves could be husht down to the rustle and ripple produced by a lady's fan. And what would be the result? That which is the only possible result of uniformity, — stagnation. The storms of the winds and waters are necessary to the purificatory processes of the universe. The father of poetry has taught us, that, even though all the winds were tied up in a bag, and entrusted to the keeping of the wisest and craftiest of men, who strains all his faculties in steering the vessel with unflagging vigilance day and night, sleep will some time or other come over him by the order of nature; and then his mischievous comrades let out the winds, which hurl the vessel away from its destined haven. It is only the aid of a higher power, that will avail *motos componere fluctus:* and for this we must wait patiently, each doing his duty in his

appointed station. Or, to take a page out of history, more than two hundred years ago it pleased King Charles, acting by the counsel of Bishop Laud, to declare his Royal will, that "in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years in different times and places exercised the Church of Christ, all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures." No doubt Charles had often thought, and it is not impossible may have been reminded by Laud himself, what a wise lesson Canute set to kings, when he shewed them how powerless they are to arrest the tide, even for an inch or an instant. Yet they deemed they could arrest a fiercer tide, which had been rolling, as they confess, for many centuries, under the sway of laws no less mighty and irreversible. This proclamation was issued in 1627, with what success the history of the next thirty years proves: and such will ever be the end of attempts to settle religious controversies by the interposition of authority.

One mode of settlement might indeed be beneficial, if there were any way of obtaining it, and any prospect; a settlement I mean, which, following the example of the Apostolic Council, would give an authoritative sanction to diversities. Still better would it be, though still less to be expected, if measures could be taken for expunging that hateful clause from the Act of Uniformity, by which its framers, of set purpose, drove the Puritans out of the Church. Much too were it to be wisht, that certain double forms of prayer might be introduced here and there for the relief of scrupulous consciences, painfully wounded by having to read offices which presuppose a totally

different state of discipline in the Church. But of these things there is little hope. The spirit of Catholic comprehension has seldom found a home in more than a very few hearts within our Church: the majority have mostly cared for little except maintaining their own position, in whatsoever manner, and however numerous the multitudes they might exclude from it. I do not mean, that the removal of hindrances and obstructions would of itself bring back our brethren, who have separated from us, into the pale of the Church. The awful words of the sleepwalking Queen, *What's done cannot be undone*, express the curse that follows every sinful act. Though we retrace our steps, we cannot regain our former position; for the world meanwhile has been rolling onward. Nor can the manifold feelings of bitterness and animosity and pride and self-will, which are generated and fostered by habitual schism, be stifled or eradicated in a moment. If our dissenting brethren are to be reclaimed, it must be the work of time, and can only be accomplisht by the preaching of the Gospel of truth and peace, and by proving that the Spirit does indeed dwell in the Church, manifesting Himself by works of holiness and love. But the taking down of the fences which have hitherto kept them out, so far as this may be done without injury to truth and order, is a requisite preparative for this work.

From the bottom of my heart however would I deprecate any attempt to put an end to our differences by establishing a stricter uniformity. To what end indeed should we do so? Do not our churches themselves teach us a very different lesson, if we cast our eyes around us in any part of the land? What rich varieties of form, and structure, and decoration, do we see in them! towers and spires, pinnacles

and parapets, from the majestic, awe-inspiring minster and cathedral, down to the little homely mother of the village, which looks like a hen gathering her chickens under her wings. Yet amid this endless variety what a sublime unity prevails! And who would exchange this beautiful diversity, even if it were practicable, for twelve thousand Brummagem churches, that should all lift up their heads in regimental uniformity, fac-similies one of another? Thus our churches themselves admonish us, that uniformity is not necessary to unity. Nay, even in the diversity of styles which we so often perceive in the same church, we may trace a higher unity, by which successive generations have been led to join in the same holy work. In the present day many of these churches have been greatly disfigured by the corruptions and the negligence of recent ages; and these disfigurements it behoves us to remove, not according to any one general sweeping plan, but by enquiring in each case what is requisite to fulfill the original idea. In like manner may the abuses, which have crept in through neglect, or whatsoever cause, into the celebration of divine worship, be corrected in each particular parish, mildly and gradually and peacefully, under the direction and guidance of the Bishop, according as occasion may require. And if some ritual differences still continue, I know not why, provided they are admitted to be lawful, these should excite any squabbles or animosities, any more than such ordinary facts, as that one church has a round arch, another a pointed.

Here let me be permitted to quote a passage from an unfinisht manuscript sermon of my brother's, which was preacht about a dozen years ago, and which may serve to shew how quietly and inoffensively certain ritual differences

were then allowed to subsist in neighbouring churches. His voice has spoken to many hearts; and not a few will perhaps feel a pleasure in recognizing his simple colloquial style, in the following attempt to give his congregation a notion of the manner in which the various Churches in Christendom unite to make up the Church or Kingdom of Christ. "The different Churches in the different countries of the world, to compare great things with small, are like the different parishes under one Bishop. The Bishopric of Salisbury for instance, in which we are living, reaches over the two counties of Wiltshire and Berkshire. In those two counties there are a great many parishes; and in each parish there is a separate congregation, with a place of worship of its own. Different parishes have different customs. In one parish there is an organ perhaps; in another there is only a village choir; in a third there is no music at all. Again, in one parish there may be two full services, in a second only one full service and prayers; in a third there may be church only once on a Sunday. It would be easy to point out other differences, were it of any use, such as slight differences of dress, one minister wearing a hood or scarf over his surplice, and another not; slight differences of prayers, some reading, as I do, the first prayer for the King in the Communion Service, and others reading the second; slight differences of custom, the Commandments being read in one parish from the Communion Table, and in another parish from the desk. These instances are enough to shew, that differences in smaller matters do exist, and are allowed to exist, in different parishes. In all these lesser points the minister of a parish is allowed to exercise his Christian liberty; nor can his brother minister in the next parish call him to account for so

doing. Still, with all these lesser and allowable differences in the several parishes of this Bishopric, the service on a Sunday morning or Sunday evening is on the main the same in all. Go into what Church you please, you will have the same Psalms, the same Lessons, the same Belief, the same Collects; and you will hear them following one another in the same order. Thus, with all the differences I have been speaking of, the form of worship throughout the whole Bishopric is, to all intents and purposes, the same. And notwithstanding their several differences, the several parishes are all united under the same head, and make one Bishopric under one Bishop."

Surely this is but the picture of a family: *Facies non omnibus una, Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum.* And supposing the great Apostle of the Gentiles had come to visit these churches, and had found these discrepancies amongst them, what, may we think, would he have done? Would he have exclaimed that such discrepancies are scandalous and intolerable, that they evince wilfulness and laxity and an open disregard of authority? or would he not have lookt upon them calmly and benignly, and said, *Go on, dear brethren in Christ Jesus, heirs of the glory to which He has called you; go on, each after his own manner, using those gifts and instruments in His service, which ye have received from the Father; go on, growing in faith, in obedience, in love toward Him and toward each other; and may the Spirit of Grace, and Truth, and Peace sanctify you, and all your acts and services, wholly against His coming.*

The question of authority has indeed been brought forward into painful prominence, as often before on similar occasions: yet I know not what can well be more unwise. Authority ought to act, not talk; to be felt rather than

heard. When it begins to prate of its rights, this is the crack which announces its fall. All the generative powers of nature work silently and invisibly; yet how wonderful and mighty are their effects! And what is the power of authority in the Church? Moral, not physical. It lies in the tacit, half unconscious recognition of the benefits which it produces, of the justice and wisdom with which it is exercised. But when it meddles with petty things, laying stress upon trifles, straining at gnats, and issuing mandates about the breadth of phylacteries, the instinctive sense of propriety and right revolts against it: and if it quotes texts to challenge obedience, its opponents will call to mind that there are other texts, equally plain and impressive, enjoining him that would be chief among the ministers of the Gospel, to be the servant of all, *even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered to, but to minister.*

This is the true foundation of the power of the Church: and when her power rests on this foundation, no man can rob her of it. O that the spirit from which such power springs, may be granted largely to the governors of our Church in this time of her need! O that they may be enricht with that true wisdom, that clear discernment between the form which killeth and the spirit which giveth life, and that living insight into the all-embracing fulness and all-reconciling freedom of the Gospel, which were vouchsafed so abundantly to St Paul!

J. C. H.

Conversion of St Paul, 1845.

TO THE VENERABLE

HENRY EDWARD MANNING,

ARCHDEACON OF CHICHESTER.

My dear Friend,

In dedicating this Sermon to you, I am not influenced solely by the desire of giving utterance to my esteem and affection, and of connecting my name with yours, as it has pleased God in His lovingkindness to associate us, by ordaining that we should be the two eyes of the spiritual Father of this Diocese. Both the occasion when this Sermon was preacht, and the subject treated in it, almost constrain me to inscribe it with your name.

For to you, far more than to any other man,—after him who was its founder, and the instrument of this as well as of so many other blessings to his Diocese,—does our Association owe its original establishment, and whatever prosperity it may since have enjoyed. Your wisdom, under God, has been our chief guide; your eloquence has stirred our hearts; your loving spirit has checkt and healed the first outbreaks of anything like division. Thus since he, whom we both loved and revered as a father, was called to his reward, before our Annual Meeting was hallowed, as he had purpost that it should

be, for the first time with a religious service, the little offering, which would otherwise have belonged to him, falls by a sort of inheritance to you.

Moreover the very subject seems to mark it as rightfully yours. Unity, the Unity of the Church, is of all things the dearest to your heart, at least only subordinate to, or rather coordinate with Truth, without which, you well know, all Unity must be fallacious. And as that which fills the heart will overflow from the lips, you yourself, several times since this Sermon was preacht, have poured out your earnest thoughts and desires for the Unity of the Church. Your sermon at the next Anniversary of our Association was devoted in great part to setting forth the spiritual principle of Unity, how it is by putting on the Mind of Christ that we shall best seek Unity and ensue it, and how our dissensions and divisions arise from our want of that mind, and from our sins against it. More recently you have made the Unity of the Church the subject of an elaborate Treatise, in which, as in all your writings, the spirit of love speaks, but in the argumentative part of which, I grieve to say, there is much I am unable to go along with. A Dedication however would be a place ill-suited for discussing the differences between us: indeed to do so effectually might require a volume scarcely inferior in bulk to your own; and the following Sermon may suggest certain points at which we diverge. In your first Charge on the other hand, where you also speak of Unity, there are half a dozen sentences on which I would crave your permission to offer some remarks. For they give a brief, summary expression to an opinion which is very dominant in these days, but which I cannot hold to be other than erroneous, and which,

whenever it has been allowed to display itself in action, has been hurtful to all true living Unity.

In the latter part of that Charge, having spoken of the manner in which the Annual Meetings of the Clergy at Visitations may serve to produce uniformity in our practice, you proceed thus: "I am prepared to hear it said that uniformity without unity is a hollow and lifeless thing. This is granted as soon as said. But will not a thoughtful, much more a philosophical mind detect something trivial and unmeaning in this rhetorical way of opposing unity and uniformity, as if they were two ideas, almost two repugnant things, instead of the outward and inward, the visible and invisible form of one and the same reality? But even though they were things separable, uniformity even without unity is at least better than discrepancy added to disunion. If we were indeed so shorn of the spirit of grace as to lack inward unity among ourselves, still there is no reason why we should inflict the visible tokens of our disunion upon the flocks committed to our charge. But after all, is it not certain that uniformity is the silent and symbolical language of unity? Is there any law in God's works, which has not its own invariable form? What is the variety of nature but the uniform expression of a variety of laws, not a various expression of any one law? Do not laws of relation, and proportion, and symmetrical figure pervade all the works of God with a severe and unerring uniformity? It is absolutely certain that, wheresoever there is unity in the idea, there will also be uniformity in the expression; and in all things which have life, the converse is also true. Dissolution of parts will break up the uniformity of organized bodies; but it is only after the

life is fled. It will linger a while in testimony of what it was, and then dissolve into multitude and variety. But there is no such thing as unity of life without a uniformity of structure and a harmony of operations: and in all moral action uniformity of practice is not only a symbol but a means to unity of will."

Now in the first place I would beg you to consider, why is it "trivial and unmeaning" to speak of Unity and Uniformity as two totally distinct and separate ideas, seeing that people are so prone to confound them, and that such evils have resulted from the confusion. Of course, if the opposition be merely "rhetorical," it may then be trivial and unmeaning. But even if uniformity were the only outward expression in which unity can manifest itself, still it is not necessarily trivial and unmeaning to urge men to meditate on the distinction between the form and the spirit; since our idolatrous fancy and understanding are so apt to mix and mistake them, and to cleave in all things mainly, if not solely, to that which is outward. Hence those persons in all ages, who have lifted up their voices against the superstitious observance of the letter which killeth, and have called men to the reasonable worship of the lifegiving spirit, are rightly honoured among the benefactors of mankind. Nay, did not our Divine Master Himself reprove those who were scrupulous in tithing mint and anise and cummin, while they neglected judgement and mercy and faith? those who made clean the outside of the cup and platter, but within were full of ravening and wickedness? At the same time I readily allow that the antiformalists also often run into excess, forgetting that, though the empty cup is sorry refreshment, the wine without the cup would

be spilt abroad, — forgetting that, in this our state of imperfect selfcontroll, forms and ordinances imposed from without are wholesome and necessary, and that it is a higher act of freedom to submit to them than to reject them. They are too apt to fall short—who indeed does not?—of that heavenly Wisdom, which taught, *These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone.*

But further, I would contend that uniformity, in the sense which in these days is usually attacht to that word, is by no means necessarily or essentially the form in which unity manifests itself; that, on the contrary, the injudicious pursuit and enforcement of uniformity have oftentimes marred unity, and must do so, from engaging in an endless struggle to efface and destroy that diversity and variety, which God has ordained shall prevail in every part of the creation. This desire of imposing uniformity is one of the commonest errours of our weak, self-relying, narrowhearted, stiffminded nature. For it is not a desire of raising ourselves and our brethren up to some ideal standard. He who could frame such a conception, would likewise discern that the only way of approximating to its accomplishment is by animating men with the same principles, and stirring them to realize those principles, as best they may, according to the gifts they have received. Nor will the seeker after uniformity be studious to conform his own conduct to that of his neighbours. Such an attempt would indeed imply an amiable humility: but it would be impracticable, since, while shaping ourselves after the model of one, we should be receding from thousands; and it would often involve a sacrifice of honest convictions. They however who want the whole world to walk in one way, are sure to

mean at bottom that this way shall be their own way. The one exemplary unit, to which men have wisht that all others should conform, has always been more or less that which occupies the largest space in our intellectual field of vision, and with the notions and feelings, the habits and circumstances of which we are the most familiar. Indeed, inasmuch as it is a point of duty to take care that what we do shall be that which our deliberate judgement deems best and fittest, a slight logical oversight will infer that the selfsame course must be best and fittest for others; although differences of position, of relations, of education, of character, of moral and intellectual habits, give rise to endless varieties in that which is obligatory and expedient.

Delusions of this kind have been a perpetual source of misconceptions, misjudgement, contemptuous and hostile feelings, and even of overt enmity, in every region in which man has had to act: but they have been far the most hurtful in the Church; because in questions pertaining to religion we too readily identify our will with God's will, and thus, instead of being checkt by that deference for others which practical life breeds, grow to fancy ourselves bound to carry our will into effect; and because all constraint from without is injurious to that, which can have no true worth, except as the free and reasonable service of the heart and mind. In the very first age of the Church obstinate attempts were made to enforce rites and ordinances, which were outward, typical, unessential, and therefore finite, mutable, and transitory. Nay, the purpose of the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, which in this as in other respects differed so widely from other Councils, was to put an end to dissension by sanctioning

diversity of practice: and though two positive regulations were enacted, as expedient under the circumstances of the Church at Jerusalem, it was soon felt that these regulations also were merely local and temporary; wherefore the Church, in a wise exercise of her liberty, thought right to remit them. St Paul too had to struggle over and over against one form or other of this delusion; and hence it is in his writings that we best learn what are the true principles of unity, and how to discriminate them from those rules of uniformity, which men are ever setting up in their stead. The former, it has often been recognized, are proclaimed for all ages of the Church in those sublime verses of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which are the text of this Sermon: and those verses are followed by an enumeration of the different gifts and offices bestowed on the various members of Christ's body, which are to *work effectually* in union, so that *the whole body shall be joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth.* Again, what a lesson full of heavenly wisdom does he give to the Church in the fourteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans! a lesson which the Church has grievously disregarded, and against which she has frequently sinned; nay, which has been shamefully evaded by persons bearing rule in the Church, under the plea that it related merely to those early ages, when Christians were living in the midst of a heathen world; as if the principles urged through that whole chapter were not of lasting obligation; as if its precepts were anything else than a setting forth of that gentleness and forbearance and love, which ought to guide the disciples of Christ in all their dealings with each other, so that no one may destroy or hurt any of those *for whom Christ died.* Or

shall we rather open the first Epistle to the Corinthians, in order to learn how there are *diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit*, and *differences of administrations, but the same Lord*, and *diversities of operations, but the same God working all in all?* and how it is the will of God that *the body should not be one member, but many*, each performing its part in ministering to the body, and to every other member of it? and how a far higher wisdom is manifested in the union of all these diverse members into one body, than *if the body were all one member?* I know not what words could prove more convincingly than this whole passage, that uniformity is not the essential form of unity, but that unity, according to the riches and fulness which God has been pleased to shew forth in His world, manifests itself best in diversity.

Here I cannot help asking you whether there is not something slightly "rhetorical" in your own antithesis, that "uniformity even without unity is at least better than discrepancy added to disunion." For, since the persons who fall under your reproof draw a broad distinction between unity and uniformity, so as even to "oppose" them to each other, it seems plain they cannot be advocating "discrepancy added to disunion," but must rather be maintaining the very truth urged by St Paul, that unity manifests itself in diversity. And as they set the two ideas of unity and uniformity in opposition, they must probably contend, — with much truth, though, it may be, with some exaggeration, — that, according to the laws of nature, of man's moral nature, as well as that of the outward world, a real living mighty unity cannot manifest itself otherwise than in diversity. This proposition would seem indeed to be directly opposed

to yours, that "uniformity is the silent and symbolical language of unity;" and still more to that implied in the question which follows: "What is the variety of nature but the uniform expression of a variety of laws, not a various expression of any one law?" But as the word *uniformity*, like every other abstract term which gets into general circulation, has become somewhat ambiguous, it is possible that some part of the apparent contradiction may arise out of this ambiguity. In our popular speech, I conceive, *uniformity* means identity in outward form or act, more especially when used with reference to the Church and its services, being generally associated with the Act of Uniformity, by which that identity was enjoined; and we use the term equally, whether the outward identity result from an identity of inward principles, or be imposed compulsorily by some external power. This however is very different from Hooker's meaning, when he says (E. P. iii. 1. 3), "The Unity of the Church of Christ consisteth in that Uniformity which all several persons thereunto belonging have, by reason of that one Lord whose servants they all profess themselves, that one Faith which they all acknowledge, that one Baptism wherewith they are all initiated." For this uniformity of the members of Christ means their being actuated by the same formative principles, and is perfectly compatible, as Hooker contends throughout his great work, with wide diversities of civil, moral, and religious acts. Hence that which is said in behalf of uniformity in Hooker's sense of the word, is no argument in favour of that very different uniformity which has been imposed on us by the Acts of our Legislature. Both may be good; but as logicians, in arguing for the latter, we must beware of using

arguments which apply solely to the former. Yet the chief part of your arguments, so far as I can understand them, seem to relate rather to the mode of operation, than to the result produced thereby. Therefore, when you say that "the variety of nature is the uniform expression of a variety of laws," the opponent of Uniformity might rejoin, *This is all I wish: let the infinite variety of human thoughts and feelings and characters find their uniform appropriate utterance in the same manner, each after its kind.* But the result of such a process, however harmonious it might be, whatever Unity there might be in it, would have nothing of the Uniformity which he condemns.

Still I must confess myself perplext by the assertion, which, though not directly enunciated, is implied in your interrogation, that "the variety of nature is the uniform expression of a variety of laws, not a various expression of any one law." Surely the aim of Philosophy and Science is, and has ever been more or less consciously, to trace up those secondary laws of nature, which they discern in their immediate operation, to their one aboriginal source: they have rightly felt the conviction that this source must be one; and though they have often overreacht themselves in the pursuit, they have made great progress therein. According to the doctrines both of Philosophy and Science, as it seems to me, the variety of nature is the varied expression of a few simple laws, diversified by the character and combination of the elements subjected to their operation. As in speech, by a few simple laws, out of a few vocal elements variously combined, we produce an almost endless variety of words, so does Nature, out of a few elements, by a few simple laws, produce an endless variety of forms

and appearances. You maintain indeed that "it is absolutely certain that, wheresoever there is unity in the idea, there will also be uniformity in the expression." If however by *uniformity* you here mean sameness, I would remind you of the common remark that no two leaves on an oak are exactly alike. In the lower orders of the creation a considerable uniformity is found, in earths, in crystals; but the higher we mount, the more it gives place to diversity. The same distinction too prevails between the different classes of the same order: firs for instance are more monotonous than deciduous trees. Moreover in all classes those species, which are affected by cultivation, acquire a greater number of varieties, to which there hardly seems to be a limit; the recent improvements in horticulture having shewn that in the seeds of the commonest flower an almost indefinite variability is latent, which cultivation may develope. A like law is discoverable in mankind. As man stands above the rest of the creation, there are far greater diversities of character in him, even in his rudest state, than in any other creature: in proportion as his intellectual and moral faculties are educed by cultivation, the varieties of individual character become more markt: and as you yourself have well said, in your Sermon *On the Mind of Christ*, when characters become perfected by putting on that mind, "they stand out with an individuality as definite and perfect as the stars of heaven."

So again in the works of the human intellect, in proportion as it is more genial, more vigorous, more refined, there will be a greater variety; while here also, when genius is extinct, when imagination is feeble, the understanding comes forward with its rules of uniformity.

You are not old enough to remember the contest against the unities, as they were misnamed, and the other uniformities, which exercised such sway in literature during the last century, and which had just been driven to their last hold at the time when I began to take interest in such questions. The illustration however may be of use: for here also it was maintained that uniformity is indispensable to unity; and the French tragic writers, belonging to a nation which has a singular faculty of degrading ideas into abstractions, deemed that in writing tragedies they must adopt the outward formal rules, which peculiar circumstances, connected with the origin of the Greek drama, imposed upon the tragedians of Athens. But Lessing, and other critics since, have shewn that this very seeking after uniformity was most inimical to unity,—that, if the great Greek poets had lived in modern Europe, the form of their compositions would have been very different,—and that there is far more real unity between the tragedies of Shakspeare and the Greek, notwithstanding the glaring dissimilarity in their outward form. Here I may remark that, as Christianity has enabled man to gain a much clearer sight of the Unity which pervades all things, Shakspeare's wonderful genius, living under the influences of Christian thought, has fused elements into unity, which the Greeks would have deemed discordant. Yet the unity in him is of a deeper and higher kind. So is the unity of Christian painting deeper and higher than that of Greek sculpture; and the unity of Christian harmony than that of Greek melody; even as the unity in the varied song of the nightingale is far more perfect than in the monotonous cry of the cuckoo; which, in spite of its uniformity, can

never blend into unity. Or, to take another familiar example, there is nothing in which the dreary dulness of the last century manifests itself more than in its town-architecture, which has but one remarkable characteristic, its uniformity. This they sought; and this they attained. You may walk for miles in London, hedged in between two similar and parallel lines of straight, high, dingy brick walls, unbroken except by regular rows of oblong holes. Yet these streets never give a conception of unity comparable to that awakened by Venice and Nuremberg and the old parts of Antwerp and Bruges. On the other hand few intelligent persons will doubt which town in England does produce the grandest impression of unity, with the rich variety of its buildings, speaking of so many centuries, but harmonized by the unity of their moral and spiritual purpose, and bearing witness that generation after generation rejoiced in consecrating their choicest gifts to bring up the youth of England in the pursuit of truth and in the knowledge of God. Nay, what is that most perfect pattern of Unity, which God has vouchsafed to establish upon earth for the comfort and blessing of mankind, and which is declared to be a type of the Unity between the Church and her Lord? It is not the union between man and man. In order that the unity may be more entire, the diversity must be greater: that which is lacking to the one, must be supplied by the other. And even among marriages those may be deemed the most perfect, not where there is the fullest uniformity and similarity, but the most harmonious contrast of characters, where each is the complement, so to say, to the other, each being according to its kind. A masculine character in the wife, an effeminate one in the

husband, may increase uniformity, but will hardly improve unity. Wordsworth, when speaking of the causes of the pleasure derived from metre, is led into a like train of illustrations. "Among the chief of these causes," he says, "is to be reckoned a principle which must be well known to those who have made any of the arts the object of accurate reflexion; I mean the pleasure which the mind derives from the perception of similitude in dissimilitude. This principle is the great spring of the activity of our minds, and their chief feeder. From this principle the direction of the sexual appetite, and all the passions connected with it, take their origin: it is the life of our ordinary conversation; and upon the accuracy with which similitude in dissimilitude, and dissimilitude in similitude are perceived, depend our taste and our moral feelings."

I have only been repeating again and again what St Paul says about the unity of the body. If a body were to be made up of arms, or of legs, or of heads, or of any one member whatsoever, how inferior would it be in unity to the human form divine! and how greatly is the unity of that form raised above that of quadrupeds by the distinction between the arms and the legs! Yet, simple as these truths are, and plainly as they are involved in that passage of St Paul, they are entirely lost sight of by those who hunger and thirst after uniformity. You yourself too, if you had borne them in mind, would hardly have written so strongly in favour of it. Nor is that which is true of individual life less true of corporate life; though in this instance also it is a truth that few statesmen are duly convinced of. For practical men, when not content with being mere practical men, but ambitious of reasoning about the work they are engaged in, will generally measure all things

by the last of their understanding, the faculty which practical life developes the most; while it rather stunts the imagination, which might have helpt them to conceive the manifold benefits accruing from diversities of circumstances, of customs and manners, of ancestral institutions and feelings. Hence it comes that our political reformers are so busy in squaring and leveling all things according to some favorite rule. Their axiom is much the same as yours, that the unity of the nation is to manifest itself in the uniformity of all its parts. This was the axiom of the jacobinical republicans; and this was the axiom of the jacobinical emperor. Few men in the last generation, and not many in this, could appreciate the truth, which Niebuhr, from his living insight into all history, discerned with such clearness, that it became one of the ruling principles of his thoughts, — the truth which he has exprest repeatedly, and which lies at the bottom of a large part of his political reflexions,—that, "as in organic beings the most perfect life is that which animates the greatest variety of members, so among states that is the most perfect, in which a number of institutions originally distinct, being organized each after its kind into centres of national life, form a complex whole." With this truth we Englishmen ought to be familiar; since our own constitution a few years back was, and perhaps still is, the noblest exemplification of it: yet many of the recent innovations in our legislation shew that we have no adequate conception of its importance. Rather are we infected with the desire of centralizing and uniforming everything. We are so intoxicated with the love of machinery, that we think mechanical action better than moral, as being surer and more punctual in its operation

And so indeed it is immediately: but we forget that one of the noblest features in the English character has arisen in great measure from that diversity of local institutions, which have awakened a higher feeling of personal responsibility than is to be found in other nations. To the meditative minds of Germany on the other hand, such thoughts have become matter of ordinary contemplation. Thus, when looking the other day over the last edition of Nitzsches *System of Christian Doctrine*, a book which is quite a digest of profound thought and learning, and one of the most precious works of recent German theology, I came to the following sentence in a newly added note, occasioned by Rothe's Treatise on the Church: "Every one will acknowledge without hesitation, that the highest unity, the most perfect catholicity, is that which comprehends, combines, and reconciles the utmost fulness of diversities." He then complains that Rothe, while he assigns all the riches of variety to the Christian State, makes the Church "a present of the shadowy grandeur, but real poverty, of uniformity:" which doubtless is among the reasons why Rothe's book has found so much acceptance in England, not indeed for his political, but for his ecclesiastical views.

Nitzsch further asks, "How is the idea of unity and universality best realized, by the voyage of the Romish Liturgy to Siam and Pekin, or by the working together of the evangelical missions in all quarters of the world?" This question reminds me of that dismal substitution of uniformity for unity, under which the heart and mind of man groaned and pined, when the Papacy, incapacitated by its very position, and the assumptions involved therein, for recognizing any other than a formal

unity, imposed a Liturgy in a dead language on all Christian congregations, of every nation and region beneath its sway, issuing its despotical edict to arrest the miracle of Pentecost, and ordaining, so far as lay in its power, that men should not hear and speak of the wonderful works of God in their own tongues, being unable to appreciate the heavenly glory of that unity, when the great multitude, *of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues*, shall stand before the throne of the Lamb. It is a painful symptom, that such an abuse should find admirers among the members of our Church in these days. They plead that it is an advantage for foreiners, when they go into a church in any country, to hear the same words with which they have been familiar from their childhood. So too forsooth many a foreiner has thought it very inconvenient that he could not hear his own language spoken at inns, in the marketplace, by the peasants when he is roaming about the country, in society when he wishes to mix in it; and he has seldom thought of asking himself whether, of the two, it would not be more reasonable that Mahomet should go to the mountain. Thus, for the sake of a few casual vagrants, the natives of every country are to be under the soul-deadening bondage of hearing words in an unknown language, and of repeating the same by rote, at the very time when the depths of their being ought to be stirred. They are to be debarred from the blessing of having their own homely words, the words which sprang up within them along with their thoughts and feelings, sanctified by being made the means of pouring forth their hearts before God. Is it not written, *Let the children first be filled?* And who can estimate the grandeur, the depth, the expansive power, which our language and the German have derived

from the national liturgical offices, as well as from the national translation of the Scriptures? What a difference is there between the very word, *word*, and *mot!* how far purer, less sensual, more spiritual are *love* and *liebe* than *amour* and *amore!* which is doubtless owing mainly to the scriptural use of those words. To a feeble imagination indeed, especially when its wings have been clipt that it may not fly beyond the purlieus of self, it will seem a grand and imposing thought, that all the nations of the earth should be uttering the selfsame words to God. But is there nothing grand and elevating in the thought, that all nations are lifting up their voices to Him, each using its own words, the words which gush from the depths of its heart, and which are fresh with the dew of its feelings? Is there nothing grand in the thought, that "Earth with her thousand voices praises God?" Verily shoals of men, if they spoke their mind, would declare that Thomas Burnet's smooth flat paradisiacal earth, as smooth and flat as the sea-sand, would be far more beautiful than the present confused jumble of mountain and valley and rock and cliff and glen. And certainly the sea-sand has the advantage on the side of uniformity; yet, unless one bring in other objects to limit it, one cannot raise it up into the idea of unity: so essential to unity is diversity. Or again what visible object can kindle the idea of unity with anything like the same power as the sight of the nightly sky, with its hosts of stars and constellations showered over it in every variety of form? Yet doubtless the uniformalist would deplore that they are not ranged in regular courses, in rows or concentric circles, like the spangles on his drawingroom ceiling. He would say, *Yes, the sky would be very beautiful, if I might but comb out its tresses, and put its jewels in order.*

I have written to you freely, discursively, in the tone of a private letter, rather than of an argumentative discussion. For I had it on my heart to speak on this matter of uniformity, which is again much talkt of now, as is natural when an age takes a bent toward the externals of religious worship: it often comes before us in the discharge of our official duties: and unless much caution be exercised by those who are in authority, it seems likely to aggravate the divisions in the Church. Hence this passage in your Charge has been quoted and praised oftener, I believe, than any other, a fate which not seldom befalls the worst passage in a book. For if a wise man says anything which countenances and seems to give a reason for a popular errour, the holders of that errour are glad to shelter themselves under the sanction of his authority, and of whatever show of argument he may bring forward in their behalf. And though you yourself, while you advocate uniformity, are animated with a true and fervent love of unity, and would never seek uniformity by any measure calculated to impair unity, yet in the generality of cases I seem to have observed, that the most clamorous and pertinacious sticklers for uniformity are those into whose hearts the desire of unity has hardly gained an entrance, and whose religion vents itself for the most part in outward observances. Indeed how could it well be otherwise? They who have seen the blessed vision of Unity, with the prayer of the Saviour breathing through it as the spirit of its life, and the smile of the Father beaming upon it, how can they turn from this, to dote upon anything so shadowy, so harsh, so empty as mere Uniformity? or how can they care much about Uniformity, except so far as it is indeed

the expression of a living love for Unity, submitting its own heart and mind to do as others do for the sake of a more entire union and communion?

At the same time, seeing that one can scarcely combat any errour, without being suspected of intending to become the champion of its opposite, I must remark, that, while impugning the notion that uniformity is indispensable to unity, I have not meant to say a single word in behalf of irregularity and licentiousness. It was indeed very sad a year ago to see your pious and learned friend Dr Pusey urging differences of ritual practice as arguments against a measure designed to prepare the way, under God's blessing, for a closer communion between our Church and that of Prussia; for it has been constantly held by the highest authorities, that, in things ceremonial, great diversities may warrantably prevail between different Churches, and that these diversities should be no hindrance to communion between them. Within the pale of each national Church on the other hand it is expedient and desirable, for the sake of order and discipline, that there should be a considerable similarity of practice; and a national Liturgy is such an inestimable benefit in many ways, that, to secure it, we should readily sacrifice whatever might be gained by a more definite expression of personal and occasional feelings. What I deprecate is the endeavour to establish uniformity for its own sake, as if uniformity in itself were a thing to be sought and admired. So far as uniformity is expedient, it is expedient from our weakness and frailty, by reason of which we cannot be left to the free utterance of our own hearts and minds; and because the submission to certain general rules and restraints is a condition of social union:

moreover in divers parts of our work our power is much strengthened by our pulling together. This truth is urged with his usual judgment by him, who alone ought to have been termed the Chancellor of Human Nature, as well as the Chancellor of Nature,—whereas the former title has been given to a man far less deserving of it,—in his excellent little treatise *On the Pacification of the Church*, which, along with the other *On Church Controversies*, might be profitably studied by all parties in these days; being rich in practical wisdom suited to all ages, but of a kind which has seldom been duly heeded, and often grossly sinned against. I will quote the closing paragraph of the part which speaks concerning ceremonies, as the remarks, even in their literal sense, are unfortunately not wholly inapplicable to our own time. "For the cap and surplice, since they be things in their nature indifferent, and yet by some held superstitious, and that the question is between science and conscience, it seemeth to fall within the compass of the Apostle's rule, *that the stronger do descend and yield to the weaker*. It will be materially said, that the rule holdeth between private man and private man, but not between the conscience of a private man and the order of a Church. But yet, since the question at this time is of a toleration, not by connivence, which may encourage disobedience, but by law, which may give a liberty, it is good again to be advised whether it fall not within the equity of the former rule; the rather because the silencing of ministers by this occasion is, in this scarcity of good preachers, a punishment that lighteth upon the people, as well as upon the party. And for the subscription, it seemeth to me in the nature of a confession, and

therefore more proper to bind in the unity of faith, and to be urged rather for articles of doctrine, than for rites and ceremonies and points of outward government. For howsoever politic considerations and reasons of state may require uniformity, yet Christian and divine grounds look chiefly upon unity." Which last sentence, among other things, may convince you that the antithesis between uniformity and unity is not altogether trivial and unmeaning. At least Bacon was so imprest with the need of enforcing the distinction, that in his Essay *On Unity in Religion* he again says, "They be two things, unity and uniformity," that is, two distinct things, which must not be confounded.

Yet, even where unity of spirit, and reverent obedience to the authority of the Church, and regard to the objects of social union, will produce uniformity of action, it is of no slight importance that we should well understand why we seek that uniformity, and why it is desirable. For in all action, if we are to do right consistently, we should act intelligently, knowing what is the ground of our acting, what is to be its end, and what its measure. Thus, if it be the duty of individual Christians to submit to the authority of the Church, for the sake of edification, both their own and that of their brethren, it becomes a correlative duty in those who legislate for the Church, and who exercise authority over it, not to press on its inferior members, not to burthen their consciences with that which is unnecessary, to deal tenderly with them, as loving parents deal with their children, yea, as the Lord Himself dealt with His disciples. They should keep in mind that excellent axiom, which Bacon quotes, and which sums up the argument of the foregoing pages,

"*Differentiae rituum commendant unitatem doctrinae*, the diversities of ceremonies do set forth the unity of doctrine." On the other hand, if it be supposed that uniformity is to be pursued for its own sake, as a thing desirable in itself, as the only outward form of unity, without which unity cannot exist, then it will be pursued at all costs, at all risks, in all things, small as well as great; and the end is, as has been seen so often in the history of the Church, of the English Church more especially, that Unity is blindly and recklessly sacrificed before the cold, empty idol Uniformity.

You indeed assert that there is a higher and weightier reason, which makes uniformity a main auxiliary in the development of the Christian life; for that "in all moral action uniformity of practice is not only a symbol but a means to unity of will." Alas, my friend! uniformity a means to unity! Is this the lesson we learn from the history of the English Church? Is this the effect which has been produced by our own Acts of Uniformity? those strange, anomalous Acts, which in their imperious character are almost peculiar to our Church, and which resulted from her singular position, when she found herself in a manner identified with the government of the State, and enabled to wield the authority of the State in girding herself round with penal enactments. Was it not the Act of Uniformity under Queen Elizabeth, that first gave birth to the Nonconformists, as a distinct, powerful, and formidable body within the pale of our Church, gathering all those varieties of feeling and opinion, which could not reconcile themselves to its requisitions, into one mass, and setting the Conformists and the Nonconformists in definite array against

each other? Many pleas may indeed be urged in excuse of the statesmen and churchmen by whom that Act was framed. The very existence of the government seemed bound up with the unity and vigour of the Reformed Church. The fallacy of that delusion, which holds unity to be inseparable from uniformity, had not then been so thoroughly exposed, as it has since been, by the teaching of philosophy, and the still more cogent lessons of history. The sanctity of man's individual conscience had never been rightly appreciated by the secular wisdom of Rome; which then, as ever, sought mainly for outward submission, and which practically sanctioned, if it did not encourage, the notion, that men might justifiably profess many things by their words and their acts, to which they found nothing answerable, and much repugnant, in their hearts and minds. For this is one of the miserable curses attacht to those who worship the idol Uniformity, that, as their aim is bent upon the form, rather than the power, of Unity, they grow to care little about the substance, provided they can get the shadow; and thus they become little scrupulous about truth, in others, and ultimately in themselves also. Nor had men learnt as yet to estimate the consequences of that epochal act in the history of the world, when by God's gracious ordinance the leaders of the Reformation put the Bible into the hands of their countrymen in their own tongue. They saw not what a mighty step this was toward the completion of the work begun on the first day of Pentecost, how a voice was now issuing over the earth proclaiming to each individual man, that he had a reason and a conscience, and that the Eternal God had vouchsafed to make known His mysterious counsels even to him, so that he was no

longer to receive certain portions of the word of life doled out to him by others, but was to read the whole himself, to study it, to meditate upon it, to speak of it to his family, and among his friends. Few saw either the blessedness of the power which was thus imparted to mankind, or the dangers to which, like all power, when abused, it might be perverted. In such a state of things it is not to be wondered at that the sagacious statesmen and churchmen who had the most influence in the Queen's councils at the outset of her reign, or that the Queen herself,—while they were rightly persuaded that the national religion ought to be one, not only in spirit and doctrine, but to a certain extent in form also,—should have drawn their cords somewhat too tight with regard to the latter. Indeed, though more latitude might have been left open on certain subjects, which were matter of contention, the engagement that her ministers shall make use of her appointed Liturgy seems to be no more than every Church is fully entitled to demand. Moreover, bound as the Queen was to feel, and to shew that she felt, herself to be the sovereign of her whole people, it became her duty, as well as her policy, not to offend that large body in the nation who still held to the authority of Rome, by departing more than was necessary from the ancient ritual and discipline. Nor does there appear to have been reason at the time for apprehending that the Act would find much opposition in any other direction. Still, although this Act would seem thus far to be nearly unobjectionable,—I am not speaking of its penalties, or of its provision for compelling attendance at church,—we may learn from its effects what a perilous career they enter upon, who deem

themselves called to enforce uniformity as a means to unity. It is one of the saddest spectacles in the history of the world, a spectacle at which angels may have wept, to see the unity of our Church shaken, her peace broken up for a whole century,—to see faithful, holy, zealous men, holding the same faith, acknowledging the same Lord, baptized by the same Spirit, earnestly desiring to serve and approach the same Eternal Father, divided for generations, and even stirred into fierce hostility against each other, by differences about a vestment or a posture. These were not indeed the sole grounds of disagreement; but these, and such as these, were the chief grounds of contention: and had these been removed, as they easily might have been, if a few more points had been left to the discretion of the minister, according to plans brought forward several times in the course of this and the following century, the breaches on matters of greater importance would have been healed, with God's blessing, by a spirit which manifested such a desire for unity, and which would have been strengthened by the might of our Lord's prayer that His disciples might partake in the perfect Unity of the Godhead. You will say perhaps,—at least other persons less mild and considerate have said, and still say,—that the men who scrupled about such things ought to have yielded their scruples to the authority of the Church. Most true, my friend! they ought; and the best of them probably would have done so, if they could have lookt at the matter with the philosophic calmness, which at the interval of two or three centuries costs so little effort. But these men were full of the recollections of the darkness and bondage out of which they had been delivered; the fears of its recurrence were not idle

fancies; they felt they had a warfare to wage; and whatever seemed identified with the errours, by which the blessed truth and power of the Gospel had so long been obscured, was an abomination in their eyes. Even without these extraordinary circumstances, if we reflect on the almost irresistible power which inveterate associations of one sort or other exercise over every child of man, we shall not deem ourselves warranted in blaming our neighbours, because on certain points their associations are not so pliant as our own. These are the very cases, of which St Paul speaks: *One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike.* What then? Does the Apostle, as any man would nowadays, pronounce one of these to be wrong, and the other right? does he bid them submit their opinions to the authority of the Church, and charge the Church to settle the difference, in order that uniformity may be upheld? What a divine sanction do his words give to the sacred liberty of conscience! *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.* Besides, the duty of those who are under authority, to obey their rulers, involves a correlative duty on the part of those who exercise authority, not to exact obedience further than is needful for the safety and well-being of the community. Indeed all governments have had a feeling of this truth; and this is one reason why laws are mainly negative, repressing that which is evil and noxious, and leaving it to powers which speak more home to the heart and conscience, to enjoin what ought to be done. Above all should this maxim regulate the conduct of such as exercise an authority derived from Him, who would not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax.

Thus it is in the history of the English Church from 1560 to 1662, that we are to trace the effects of the first grand experiment to employ uniformity as a means to unity. I call it the first, because, though Procrustes is renowned as an ardent uncompromising lover of uniformity, it is not recorded that he aimed at fostering unity thereby: and that which was wholesome in the Spartan constitution, and other like institutions, was not the uniformity, which was deadening, but the severe physical and moral training: nor was the purpose to promote unity, in which it would have signally failed, but strength, by subjecting the whole nation to the strict discipline of an army. For thus far uniformity is indeed beneficial, and almost indispensable, so far as men are to be dealt with as machines, whether in a manufactory, or on a field of battle. But the framers of our first Act of Uniformity did desire and propose to themselves to unite the whole nation, so far as they could,—at least all that part of it which had embraced the doctrines of the Reformation,—in one religion under the supremacy of the Queen. Nor had they cause to anticipate the strong opposition which they were about to excite; whereby personally they stand exculpated. This however only shews the more convincingly how the attempt to enforce uniformity will of itself provoke division, calling out differences, which would else have subsisted amicably side by side, into definite, contentious opposition. Several of our wiser prelates indeed, when they discovered the unforeseen result, did what they could by their mildness and forbearance to allay the disputes: but their success at best could not be more than partial, so long as the Act itself continued a permanent symbol of separation. Nor was the Act allowed to slumber: it

led to prosecutions, to penalties: and ever and anon an utterance of royal will commanded that the nation must be uniform, and must be united; as when Queen Elizabeth wrote to Archbishop Parker, that she was "certainly determined to have all such diversities, varieties, and novelties, amongst them of the clergy and her people, as bred nothing but contention, offense, and breach of common charity, and were also against the laws, good usages, and ordinances of her realm, reformed and represt, and brought to one manner of uniformity through her whole realm and dominion;" or as when James the First at the Hampton Court Conference silenced his opponent by the clenching argument, "I will have one doctrine and one discipline, one religion in substance and in ceremony; and therefore I charge you never to speak more to that point,—how far you are bound to obey,—when the Church hath ordained it." The Queen must have known how hard it was to keep her frill, however stiffly starcht, smooth and in order for a single day: the King had ample experience of the impossibility of curbing his own words and thoughts in regard to the merest trifles: and yet they audaciously fancied they could drill every subject in their dominions into putting the same uniform on his heart and mind. Thus indulgence failed to heal the dissensions, because the ground of them could not be taken away: severity on the other hand widened and embittered them. At such a crisis two courses lie open. The chief causes of difference might have been removed: this was the course recommended by the wisdom of Bacon, and accorded with the spirit which animated the wisest and best men of the age, from Grindal down to Ussher. But the σχολαστικὸς, from whom we learnt so many sapient lessons in our boyhood,

when he had been promoted to be a schoolmaster, was heard to say, *I have been flogging my boys assiduously every day the last year: yet they have not learnt anything: I must flog them twice a day next year.* This happy unconsciousness that there is any other element in teaching, beside the use of the rod, may have been peculiar to our old companion: but the process of reasoning, that, when a certain degree of severity has aggravated an evil, the severity must be redoubled to remove it, is common among all classes of men, nor least so among those who meddle in statecraft; notwithstanding the lesson taught them by the history of Rehoboam, who lost the ten tribes by this very policy, a lesson confirmed by manifold subsequent experience. Such notions were very prevalent, when God was pleased to hasten the judgement on our Church by placing Archbishop Laud at the head of it. This prelate is the favorite hero and saint of the worshipers of uniformity; and not without a good claim to their admiration. It was said of old, that *love fulfilleth the law;* but his doctrine was, that, if you make people keep the letter of the law, they will gain love. There is something marvellous in the pertinacity with which he ever clings to the conviction, that, if the outside of the platter be cleansed, all will be right. When he was chosen Chancellor of your University, his great anxiety, evinced by reiterated earnest remonstrances, is about *formalities*, that is to say, the academical dress: he complains that *formalities*, "which are in a sort the outward and visible face of the University, are in a manner utterly decayed," and says, "If this go on, the University will lose ground every day both at home and abroad:" he charges the Heads to take care that the members of the University should "fit themselves with

formalities fitting their degrees, that the University may have credit by looking like itself; *and then I doubt not but it will be itself too. For it will not endure but to be as it seems.*" These last words, which sum up the creed of the uniformalists, are a curious mark of the outwardliness and superficiality of Laud's mind, — in his heart there was better stuff; — which same character is betrayed by the whole tenour of his most meagre Diary, by the dreary triviality and dearth of imagination in his dreams, and by many sad testimonies in his conduct as a ruler of the Church. For how else can we conceive that an honest, conscientious man, appointed to discharge the office of a bishop in the Church of God, should never, as it would seem, have been disturbed by the thought, that it behoved him to dwell in his Diocese, stirring up the hearts of its clergy and other members by doctrine, by exhortation, by pastoral advice, strengthening the feeble, encouraging the irresolute, cheering the timid and desponding, and guiding those who needed counsel? that, though he was bishop of St David's for four years and a half, he only visited his Diocese twice during that period, for about two months each time, at a quadriennial Visitation? that, though he was Bishop of Bath and Wells for near two years, he never set foot in his Diocese? And what was he doing all the while? Doubtless, having tried to put the *formalities* right by his Articles at his Visitation, he trusted that everything would go right, and so thought he might employ himself in more important business as a hanger-on at Whitehall and Buckingham House. Alas, my friend, that such a man should have been selected by our modern uniformalists and ecclesiolaters, as the pattern of a churchman and a saint! a man who, when he had carried his point of

making Bishop Juxon Lord High Treasurer, wrote down in his Journal, "*And now, if the Church will not hold up themselves under God, I can do no more.*" I hardly know what words could have betrayed a grosser, shallower ignorance of what the Church is, and wherein her power lies; as though this were the true mode of promoting the increase of that Kingdom, which has been declared to be not of this world; as though one word of faith, one deed of love, one silent prayer were not far mightier to strengthen the Church, than all the Lord-Treasurerships of all the treasures that Mammon has ever piled up in any quarter of the globe. When such a man, — I speak not of his conduct at his trial and death; that was truly heroic and saintly; but, though his end would otherwise lead us to overlook the faults of his previous life, it must not do so when that life itself is held up as a pattern for our age to learn the art of governing the Church; — when such a man was bent to establish his views of uniformity, as the means of regenerating the Church, it cannot surprise a person, who knows anything of the strong and fervid spirits he had to contend with, that, instead of raising the condition of the Church, he overthrew it, falling himself first, with a fortitude and meekness worthy of a high place in the army of martyrs.

The Church was overthrown; and her fall was hastened, to say the least, by the stubborn policy of her Primate; as it was mainly occasioned from the first by her narrow-minded love of uniformity. As one proof how the very attempt to compress men's minds makes them fly asunder in all directions, I will cite a few words from Sanderson's Visitation Sermon in 1641: "I cannot dissemble my fear that it is but too true, by the proportion of

what we almost daily hear, or see, that, within little more than this one twelvemonth last past, there have been more false and superstitious doctrines vented in the pulpits and presses of England, than have been, in so open and daring a manner, in the whole space of almost fourscore years before, I mean since the first of Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory." This was the immediate effect of the futile attempt to repress such opinions by force. In order that the firy spirits thus kindled should burn themselves out, the Monarchy and the Church of England were swept away; and a free licence and scope were granted to all manner of opinions by Cromwell. Hereby men were taught "to feel the weight of too much liberty," and to long for what they had lost, for the ancient Government, for the Liturgy, for the Church. At the same time the King's Declaration of October 1660, one of the wisest state-papers ever issued, laid down principles, which, if they had been acted upon in a candid, conscientious, peace-loving spirit, would have done much for the pacification of our Church, and would have raised it to a power and dignity and efficiency far beyond what it ever has, or seems ever likely to attain. A strange voice past through England, a voice which spake of unity; but it was soon stifled by the tumultuous cries of opposite parties clamouring in rivalry for uniformity. And ere long all hope was blasted by that second, most disastrous, most tyrannical and schismatical Act of Uniformity; the authors of which, it is plain, were not seeking unity, but division. With evident design its provisions were made so stringent, the declaration required by it was worded with such exactive precision, that it was scarcely possible for an honest Presbyterian to make it: here and there one, whose habits of

thought and temper had preserved him from strong opinions, might: but for the great body no alternative remained, except to belie their conscience, or to cut themselves off from the national Church: and one can hardly doubt that this must have been the purpose of the framers of the Act. The excuses which may be urged for the first Act, have no place here: and though it is often pleaded in palliation of political parties, that their measures have been taken under the exasperation of suffering and the intoxication of victory, this would be a sorry apology for the conduct of an ecclesiastical government. No question could now be entertained about the prevalence and permanence of the scruples, which it was resolved to set at nought: they had been handed down for three generations, and had become more and more widely diffused, not among the rabble, but among men of exemplary holiness and zeal. Yet, with a full knowledge of all this, it was required that every minister, not only such as might be ordained thenceforward, but all who at that time had any benefice or promotion, should solemnly declare their "unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer." This was enjoined, it is stated, "to the end that uniformity in the public worship of God (which is so much desired) might be speedily effected." The previous canonical declaration, that the Prayerbook "contains nothing contrary to the word of God," was hardly more than was implied in the engagement to make use of the Prayerbook in public worship. But this strait waistcoat for men's consciences could scarcely have been devised except by persons themselves of seared consciences and hard hearts, by persons ready to gulp down

any oath, without scruple about more or less. Verily, when I think of that calamitous and unprincipled Act,—of the men by whom it was enacted, Charles the Second, and the Aristocracy and Gentry of his reign,—of the holy men against whom it was enacted,—it seems almost like a prologue to the profligacy and infidelity which followed closely upon it. But what were its direct effects with regard to the Unity of the Church? It bore the name of Uniformity on its forehead: can there have been any who persuaded themselves that a Uniformity so enforced could be a means to Unity? The only Unity that could have ensued from it would have been that of a dead level: and full of woe as have been the consequences of this Act in its failure, they would have been still more terrible had it succeeded. Therefore even we, who love and revere our national Church above every earthly institution, may bless God that it did not succeed. We may bless God, for that He has given such grace and power to weak, frail, human hearts, that meek and humble men, when strengthened by His Spirit, are not to be driven out of the path in which their conscience commands them to walk, by the leagued forces of King and Parliament and Convocation, by the severest penal enactments, or even by the bitter pang of having to leave their loved flocks. Yes, my friend, we may join in giving God thanks for the work He has wrought in such men,—for they are the true salt of the earth,—even though we may deem that there was much of errour in their judgements and opinions, almost as much as in our own. Yet how grievous was the wound to the Church at the time! how grievous is it still at this day in its enduring effects! Some two thousand ministers, comprising the chief part, it seems scarcely

questionable, of the most faithful and zealous in the land, were silenced in one day, were severed in one day from their flocks, were cast in one day out of our Church, for the sake of maintaining Uniformity. On that our English Bartholomew's day, the eye wandered over England, and in every fifth parish saw the people scattered abroad as sheep that had no shepherd. From that day do we date the origin of that constituted dissent and schism, which is the peculiar opprobrium and calamity of our Church, by which in almost every parish we find ourselves grievously crippled in our efforts to build up our people into a holy temple acceptable to the Lord; and which in this very year, by its frantic uprore, is rendering it impossible for our Legislature to take any efficient step toward the moral and religious education of the people, although the disclosure of the frightful condition of huge masses of our population seemed for a moment to have allayed the contentions of political parties. So terribly is the sin of our forefathers, who framed the Act of Uniformity, visited upon England at this day; nor can any human foresight discern either how or when these evils are likely to terminate. Moreover, after that we had thus cast out so much faith and zeal and holiness, after that,—to use an expression which has been applied less appropriately to a later event of far minor importance,—we had in this manner almost cast out the doctrine of Christ crucified from the pale of our Church, we had to travel through a century of coldness and dreariness and barrenness, of Arminianism and Pelagianism, of Arianism and latent Socinianism,—all which were found compatible with outward uniformity,—before the spirit, which was then driven away, returned with anything like the same power. And the unhappy

descendants of those who were then cast out, they too have suffered wofully for the sins of their forefathers, who in the time of their prosperity had been no less blindly zealous in sacrificing faith and hope and love to the same all-beguiling idol, Uniformity. They have suffered in being severed from the unity of the Church and of the nation: they have suffered in that narrowmindedness, those prejudices and jealousies, which are the heirloom of all sectaries: above all, they have suffered in losing the most precious part of that sacred deposit of faith, which our Lord gave to be the riches and life of His Church unto the end of the world.

Such are the lessons taught by the history of our Church concerning the efficacy of Uniformity, when enforced as a means to Unity. Nor, it seems to me, would a thoughtful, much more a philosophical mind look for any other. For unity is spiritual, pertains to the spiritual part of man, his heart, his mind, his will. Even in lower things a unity formed by aggregation, or agglomeration, or colligation, is merely factitious, like the unity of a sandheap, or of a fagot. If branches are to form a unity, they must be organized into it by a central vital principle. In children we often see how deadening an education of formalities is; and hence does it come to pass that such a swarm of persons walk about the world, whose moral being has been stunted and almost crusht in their childhood. To such unhappy victims of uniformity, the imposition of uniformity will be tolerable, and may even seem desirable; as is wittily signified by the fabulist, when he makes the fox who has lost his tail so urgent in pressing his brethren to pass an Act of self-mutilating Uniformity. But in proportion as a man's intellectual and moral and spiritual being have

been cultivated jointly, in the same proportion, as I have already observed, with reference to a like remark of your own, will the true genuine individuality of his character be called forth: and though the best men will ever be ready to become all things to all, for the sake of saving some, they who are accustomed to walk in the light of principle must needs feel a repugnance to that which is merely formal, especially when particular forms are associated with inveterate corruptions and abuses. Are all such men to be debarred at once from the ministry of the Church, because they entertain conscientious scruples on certain points acknowledged to be indifferent? The Act of Uniformity says *Yes*: the spirit of true Catholic Christianity says, *No*. The Church that does so exclude them, maims herself, by forfeiting the services of numbers who would have served her faithfully: many of these, feeling an inward call to the ministry, which they cannot follow within the pale of the Church, join the ranks of schism: and while the Act of Uniformity thus casts out many of the best fish from the net, all the bad, all the careless, all the unscrupulous, all the unprincipled may abide in it unmolested. The age which enacted this rigid ecclesiastical uniformity, was addicted, as might be imagined, to the practice of uniformalizing all things. It tried to uniformalize men's heads by dressing them out in fullbottomed wigs. It tried to uniformalize trees by cutting them into regular shapes. It could not bear the free growth and luxuriance of nature. Yet even trees, if they have any life, disregard the Act of Uniformity, and branch forth according to their kinds, so that the shears have constant work to clip their excrescences; and none submit quietly except the dead.

What then is to be the symbol of the unity of a national

Church? On this head I feel sure of having your cordial concurrence; and to you, as to me, it cannot but be a satisfaction, that on this head we have the authority of that great teacher, whom we both admire and honour, and to whom we both thankfully acknowledge the deepest intellectual obligations. Coleridge, in his Notes on Baxter's Life of himself, which are rich in valuable remarks on ecclesiastical matters, speaks of a Liturgy as the only means whereby the unity of doctrine and worship requisite in a national Church can be effectually and beneficially secured. A Liturgy does this, because it is not an outward bond,—so far as it is turned into such, its beneficial operation is frustrated,—but because it addresses itself immediately to the heart and mind in the moments of their highest exaltation, and awakens and bears aloft the slumbering spirit,—because by means of it we are knit together into one body in the presence of God, joining in pouring forth the same prayers, one with another and one for another, the same confession of sin, the same supplications for mercy and grace, the same thanksgivings and hymns of praise. But how, it may be askt, can a Liturgy be upheld, unless there be uniformity in its observance? That it may subsist for centuries, and be a great blessing to a nation, with something far short of absolute uniformity, is sufficiently proved by the history of our own Church since the Reformation: for in spite of Acts of Parliament, which aimed at moral impossibilities, it is notorious that diversities of practice in sundry respects have prevailed. In essentials indeed, in all that pertains to the foundations of the Christian faith, a difference may involve a severance from the body of the Church, or at all events rightfully exclude a man from the office of

teaching therein. But it is well known that, on the principal points of doctrine, the original Nonconformists, and the bulk of those who have been called the Orthodox Dissenters, have readily assented to the tenets of our Articles, and to the spirit of the chief part of our Liturgy. The differences and controversies have almost all been on secondary points, and for the main part with regard to matters acknowledged to be indifferent. Yet, as the conferences on these questions were conducted on the general assumption that uniformity was indispensable, they were utterly useless. The dominant party brought forward what they deemed, and what commonly were, sufficient arguments to justify the establisht practice; and then they thought they had done all they were called upon to do. Few things are sadder than the records of those conferences. They display learning, ingenuity, logical and sophistical dexterity, but hardly a gleam of Christian spirit, of that gentleness, meekness, forbearance, or of that desire for peace and unity, which ought to have presided at them. Hence the remonstrants were dismist unconvinced, and rather confirmed than shaken in their opposition. Whereas, if the right order had not been inverted, —if the parties in the conference had set before their minds that their aim should be to cherish unity, instead of enforcing uniformity,—if they had rightly understood that the blessing of a Liturgy is not, that it makes the whole congregation repeat the same words, and go through the same postures and gestures, but that it touches their hearts with the same live coal from the altar, and unites them in the consciousness of the same need, the same weakness, the same frailty, in the same cry for mercy and help, in the assurance of the same gracious deliverance,

and in the same songs of thankfulness and praise, — surely it would have been recognized that the primary ought not to be sacrificed to the secondary, the essential to the indifferent; it would have been felt that whatever tended to disturb and mar this heavenly unity ought to be done away. The question would no longer have been, can we find a sufficient authority in antiquity, or in the reason of things, to justify this practice? but, is this practice of such paramount importance, so intimately bound up with the life of Christian truth, that we must rather cast our brethren out of the Church, than allow them to remain in the Church, if they will not conform to it? Had there been anything like such a hearty desire to remove the stumblingblocks, the chief part of them would have been removed. I do not mean that the Nonconformists ought to have been allowed to remodel the Prayerbook at will, or to expunge or alter any parts of it that were dear to the rest of the Church. But how easy would it have been to have introduced a few more double forms, leaving it to the discretion of the minister to choose which he preferred! In fact this very course, which otherwise would doubtless be branded as a device of modern liberalism, is pointed out explicitly in the King's admirable Declaration above referred to. Some may fancy that such diversities of practice between neighbouring parishes would have led to disputes; and you yourself seem to favour such a notion, when you say that, "if we lack inward unity among ourselves, still there is no reason why we should inflict the visible tokens of our disunion upon the flocks committed to our charge." For my own part however, I am persuaded that, were it not for the meddling cravers after uniformity, our flocks would pay little heed to such

diversities of practice, at least if we are careful to feed them with that which is more substantial. You probably remember Jeremy Taylor's excellent remarks on a kindred subject at the beginning of his *Liberty of Prophesying:* still you will not forbid my quoting words so full of mild wisdom, written in a spirit so congenial to your own. "We see that in many things, and those of great concernment, men allow to themselves and to each other a liberty of disagreeing, and no hurt neither. If diversity of opinions were of itself the cause of mischiefs, it would be so ever; but that we see it is not. For there are disputes in Christendom concerning matters of greater concernment than most of those opinions that distinguish sects and make factions; and yet, because men are permitted to differ in those great matters, such evils are not consequent to such differences, as are to the uncharitable managing of smaller and more inconsiderable questions. It is of greater consequence to believe right in the question of the validity or invalidity of a deathbed repentance, than to believe aright in the question of purgatory; and the consequences of the doctrine of predetermination are of deeper and more material consideration, than the products of the belief of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of private masses: and yet these great concernments, where a liberty of prophesying in these questions hath been permitted, have made no distinct communion, no sects of Christians; and the others have; and so have these too in those places where they have peremptorily been determined on either side. Since then, if men are quiet and charitable in some disagreeings, that then and there the inconvenience ceases; if they were so in all others, where lawfully they might,—and they may in most,—Christendom should be no longer rent in pieces,

but would be redintegrated in a new Pentecost." These words apply with still greater force to such matters as are merely ceremonial; with regard to which, disputes so readily flare up, because the grounds of them strike upon the senses and cannot be overlookt, and because all manner of persons are hence easily led to take part in them. And surely we might learn this lesson at least from the discrepancies in the Gospels, that differences of the letter are immaterial when the spirit is one. Even in the two records of the Lord's Prayer, brief as it is, there are diversities: for the Spirit of God is more careful to guide the thoughts of the heart, than the words of the lips.

I know, they who desire to act in the manner here recommended, are sure to be met with those stupid and mischievous saws, that one concession brings on another, and that, when you have once begun to give way and to change, you can never tell where you will be able to stop. Harmless as these sayings may seem in their utter fatuity, it is difficult to estimate the mass of injury they have done to mankind. By means of them pride and indolence and obstinacy have bolstered themselves up in their favorite system of inertness, gaining the too ready concurrence of the timid and feebleminded good. Nor have these sayings, when listened to, ever failed to justify themselves. For they withhold men from conceding, until the concession is extorted from them: and then it is yielded grudgingly, reluctantly; it does not come as an act of grace, and thus carries no grace to the receivers; who, irritated by long contention, and having learnt their own strength from the constraint they have exercised over their adversaries, have been prepared to crave for more, and

emboldened to insist upon it. Surely a wise man will say, *If a concession ought to be made, let me make it forthwith, and thus gain that only real strength which arises from being in the right. Then, should a concession which ought not to be made, be demanded of me, the very strength accruing to me from this act will better enable me to refuse it.* O that people could be brought to believe that right is always might, and that wrong is always weakness!

In the remarks which I have allowed myself to make on the Acts of Uniformity, you may perhaps think I have been proceeding on a misconception of your meaning; for that you never intended to express, nor do your words imply, any approval of a compulsory uniformity, as a means to unity, but merely of such a uniformity as shall result from the voluntary sacrifice of individual prejudices and predilections, out of deference to authority, and from the desire of peace and concord. I know it, my friend: the kindness of your heart would shrink from penalties to enforce uniformity, while your conviction of the spiritual character of Christian truth would discern that such measures are repugnant to the Gospel, and no less inefficient for producing their designed effect, than the chains of the demoniac among the tombs were to restore him to his right mind. Still the Acts of Uniformity, as appears on the face of them, with all their disastrous effects, were founded in great measure on the very opinion which you have been maintaining, that uniformity is indispensable to unity, and a means to it. And though it is a happy privilege of the meek and pious, that errours of human opinion, however firmly held by them intellectually, will be counteracted and neutralized by the higher wisdom of the heart, yet in

ordinary minds such errours beget restless wishes to realize false ideals; and when a man of arbitrary temper, like Laud, is invested with authority, they lead him, if they fall in with the bent of his mind, to work much mischief. Hence it seems to me that no slight service would be rendered to the Church, if any one could help toward setting men's minds right on the relation between unity and uniformity, and toward exploding the noxious errour that uniformity is indispensable to unity. For though the abovementioned illustrations of the mischiefs which this errour has caused, are taken from bygone ages of our Church, the need of the warning which they hold out is not gone by. At this day far too many persons are harassing themselves and their neighbours through their anxiety to establish a strict uniformity: too many are magnifying rites and ceremonies, vestments and postures, as if these were the essentials of Christian worship, and as if the peace of the Church might be compromised for the sake of attaining to uniformity in such things. At this day how few understand and recognize the great truth enunciated in the words quoted above, that *differentiae rituum commendant unitatem doctrinae!* Yes, my friend, let us seek unity with all our heart and soul, but not by the way of uniformity, which will never lead to it, but will waste our time by throwing up trippingstones at every other step. Let us rather seek it by those spiritual means which our Lord gave to His Church, by doing what in us lies to draw our brethren more and more to the one Faith in the one Lord through the one Spirit, whereby alone can any be brought to the one God and Father of all. Let us seek it, as our beloved father, Bishop Otter, sought it, by endeavouring

to inspire others with the same love which filled his own breast. The blessings which sprang from his brief episcopate may convince us, if we needed a fresh proof, that this is the true way to seek unity, the more excellent way, which has too commonly been abandoned for the barren, unprofitable way of uniformity.

From him, our beloved father, as I bid you farewell, my thoughts turn to another dear Friend, who has in like manner been taken from us to his reward. He too had the true principle of unity in his heart, the love of God, manifesting itself in overflowing love to man. God has taken him from us to a world where all his yearnings after love and unity will be satisfied; but to us, to this Diocese, the loss is a heavy one; few could be so heavy. At our public Meetings, at which, in this divided and distracted state of our Church, discordant opinions and feelings will sometimes find utterance, it was ever his wont to call us away from these points of contention, and to pour a reconciling spirit over the whole; wherefore, whenever I had anything to do with the arrangement of such Meetings, I endeavoured to manage that our departed friend should close the discussion. For his Christian sincerity and earnestness and love, and his entire freedom from party-spirit, his ready recognition of every spark of divine grace, under whatever form it might shew itself, were known and appreciated by all; and every asperity of feeling was straightway dispelled, as soon as Robert Anderson began to speak. By the following Sermon I am especially reminded of him in more ways than one: for he, in his usual affectionate manner, proposed at our Anniversary Meeting that I should be requested to print it; and since then, with that

gentle playfulness which so well became him, he has several times rallied me for my long delay. Moreover, when I came down from the pulpit, he was the first person who spoke to me; and as his heart was ever longing after that blessed Communion whereby the faithful become one with each other in their Lord, he exclaimed with reference to the wish I had exprest, "*O why are we not going now to kneel before that table, and partake one with another of the blessed Body and Blood of the Saviour?*" Such recollections become precious, when they belong to one, who, we may feel a confident trust, has entered into the perfect Communion of the Saints in the presence of the Lord.

To Bishop Shuttleworth we owe it that the next Anniversary of our Association was no longer destitute of its crowning blessing: and I trust that every fresh Anniversary will in like manner renew and strengthen the holy bond of brotherhood among the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese. In this wish and prayer, you, my dear Friend, I know, will join from the bottom of your soul. And now let me crave your forgiveness for this long, and, I fear, wholly unprecedented Dedication; in which, you will probably say, with one of your placid smiles, I have been quite acting up to my principles, and shewing a grand disdain for everything like uniformity. When I began, I thought a few pages would hold all I had to say; but the deep interest of the subject has led me on: and how many things still remain unsaid, which, it seems to me, might serve to elucidate and establish the propositions I have been attempting to maintain! I have exprest many differences from the opinions you have given utterance to in your Charge; yet I believe the real

difference between us is far less than it would seem. At all events I trust in God that, so long as we are permitted to live and work together, we shall also be permitted to shew practically, that unity may exist without uniformity, and that the diversities of opinion and feeling, which on many subjects prevail between us, will in no wise impair the unity of affection by which we are bound to each other, or our unity of action in the service which we owe to the Church and her Lord. If I may without presumption apply words, which were spoken of wiser and holier men, may the surviver of us be enabled to say, as Archbishop Bramhall said of himself and Ussher, who in like manner differed from him on sundry points of opinion and feeling; "I praise God that we were like the candles in the Levitical temple, looking one toward another, and both toward the stem. We had no contention among us, but who should hate contention most, and pursue the peace of the Church with swiftest paces."

Your affectionate friend,

J. C. Hare.

Whitmonday, 1843.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

Ephesians iv. 4, 5, 6.

There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

The desire of unity is inherent in man. It pervades all the expressions, all the modifications of his being, and may in a manner be termed an elementary principle of his nature. It lies, very often without his being conscious of it, at the bottom of all the workings of his mind, which is ever seeking, in one way or other, to infuse unity into the objects of its contemplation, to bring them under one head, to arrange them under one law, to find out some analogy, some relation, some likeness and harmony amongst them. Hence it manifests itself more or less in the whole structure of language, in the speech of the rudest tribes, as well as of the most refined. For the whole of language, even among the rudest tribes, is made up of general terms; that is, of words which do not merely stand for one single act or object, but are common to several, and which always imply certain processes whereby the mind has exerted its unifying power in classing a number under one head. Every one who has watcht the development of the minds of children, must have noticed how rapid and powerful this unifying spirit is in them,

how eagerly they exercise their childish royalty in bringing things together in new associations and combinations. On the other hand the faculty of detecting differences is less vivid in them. As that does not spring from an inward principle, but is rather forced upon the mind by the observation of outward objects, it requires the training and discipline of experience, and thus belongs to the wisdom of practical life, beyond which few are allowed to soar. Nevertheless in this, as in so many other respects, the highest wisdom returns to that, which had been the instinctive utterance of childhood; and while the efforts of all Science are to discover and demonstrate the unity of the laws of nature, the might of Poetry is displayed in investing all things with a unity of feeling, and Philosophy is ever yearning and seeking after the one allpervading principle of the universe.

That this desire of beholding unity in all things arises from that unity of consciousness, in which man was made, and in which his Maker mirrored His own unity, cannot well be doubted. But while we have this principle of unity within us, we are set in the midst of a world, in which everything, when we first look out over it, seems to jar and war against all unity, a world which at first sight may seem to be just emerging or subsiding out of Chaos. The character of the outward world, as it presents itself to our senses, is not unity, but multitude. It rushes upon us wave after wave, with a confused noise of many waters, entering into our minds by every inlet, taking possession of us, and almost overwhelming us. Its name is Legion. We try to bind it; but it bursts our chains. We strive with all the craft of our understanding, we send out the whole host of our faculties, to reduce it to unity:

for a while it seems to submit; we flatter ourselves that our object is effected: when anon we perceive that a thread in our network has slipt, whereby the whole unravels, and all the treasures, which we deemed secured in it, are scattered abroad.

The principle, I said, which leads and compells us to seek for unity in all the objects of our contemplation, notwithstanding the diversity and multiplicity and contrariety wherewith they assail us, is the unity of our consciousness, in which our Divine Maker mirrored the unity of His own being. Accordingly it is only so far as we retain this true unity in ourselves, that we can succeed in discovering a living unity without us. That there must be an essential unity pervading all God's works, is implied indeed in the very fact of their being His works. Even in man's works, in the works of the same man, there is a unity, whereby they reveal the mind they spring from; though, as in all men there is more or less of disorder and distraction, the harmony in all has been marred and is incomplete. In a far higher degree then must there be a unity running through all the works of Him who is essentially and entirely and indivisibly and eternally One. But this true unity we cannot make out, unless we gain sight of its principle, unless we have hold of the only clue with the aid of which we can explore the multitudinous chambers in the endless labyrinth of the universe, — unless we can trace back the countless streams of life to their one primary source in the Wisdom and Goodness of their Author. Cut off from this source, they seem unconnected, vagrant, often opposite. Hence there are two main causes, through the combined operation of which we are apt to miss unity; and no man has ever

lived, over whom these two causes have not both of them continually exercised more or less sway. Both of them are the results of that separation from God, of that depravation of the Divine Idea in man, which took place at the Fall; unless it would be more correct to say that they are both parts of that very act through which man fell.

The first of these two causes lies in that departure and estrangement from God, whereby man has set up his own will in the place of God's will, his own wisdom in place of God's wisdom, and has sought in his own understanding for the key to the mysteries of the universe, instead of endeavouring to ascertain the mind of God by a patient and diligent examination of the various manifestations wherein that mind is revealed. Thus man quitted the true centre of truth, and took his stand at a false centre, even his own individual self, and so, looking from that false centre, saw everything distorted, disproportioned, out of place, and in confusion. This proneness to take a false centre,—to set up ourselves as the centre of all things, round which all things are to revolve, to which all things are to be subordinate, and for the sake of which all things were made,—is so strong in our fallen nature, that in no respect can it be overcome, unless by laborious and long-continued experience and reflexion. The most conspicuous example of this propensity, which the history of human knowledge presents, is the well-known one of the Ptolemaic system of the universe; which, starting from the self-centring notion, that this earth, the habitation of man, must needs be the centre of the heavenly sphere,—a notion universal and almost indelible,—endeavoured with singular ingenuity to account for all the phenomena of

the heavens on this erroneous hypothesis. In this case however the fallacy is one, which the nature of our consciousness and that of our perceptive organs force upon us. It is one common to all mankind, resulting inevitably from their position and constitution; and since it is but slightly connected with the will, or referable to any moral obliquity, no mischief of importance has accrued from it. Indeed the theory founded thereon enabled men to gain divers correct glimpses of the true unity of the world. Of a far worse character are the errours arising, not from a false position common to all mankind, but from that which is peculiar and individual,—the errours mixt up with individual partialities or antipathies, springing from national or local prejudices, from those of a class, of a form of government, of a sect. In all these and sundry other ways, man has ever been apt to make himself the centre of all things, to make the accidents of his own condition the canon of right and wrong, so that whatever agrees with his own circumstances is to be admired and approved, whatever differs from them is to be reprobated and condemned. Our own form of government, we assume and proclaim, is the only good form of government; our own laws are the only wise laws; our own creed is the only true creed; and whatever differs from it is not only false intellectually, but implies a vicious and degraded state of mind. Nay, even the caprices of our manners, and the very fashions of our dress, we magnify, so as to look with displeasure on everything that does not accord with them. In these feelings and thoughts, as in all that are widely diffused, there is an element of truth; else they could not have gained their currency: in all coin, however mixt with alloy, there is a portion of the

genuine metal. It is right and fitting that we should prize and love and be thankful for the manifold blessings with which the goodness of God has surrounded us in this world. It is right and fitting that we should love our country, our home, the home of our fathers, the laws and institutions under which they and we have grown up, the Church in which God has placed us, with all its rites and ordinances. We should love these blessings thankfully, faithfully, fervently, devotedly, so as to count it an honour and privilege if we are permitted to offer up any sacrifice, even that of our lives, in defending and preserving them. Allowably too may we *take pleasure in the stones* of our country, and *favour the dust* thereof. That which is wrong and blameworthy and injurious, is not our love and admiration for our own country, but our dislike and reprobation of other countries, not that which is positive in our feelings, but that which is negative and exclusive, not our attachment to that which we know, but our contempt for that of which we are ignorant. It is, that our light, after the manner of earthly lights, only sets forth and glorifies itself, and the objects immediately around, throwing the distance into thicker darkness, instead of being diffusive, like heavenly lights, and irradiating all things. Nor is this negative portion of our feelings at all requisite, as some may narrowmindedly suppose, for the support of the positive. Even if we wanted a crutch to lean on, we should not strengthen our footing by using our crutch as a club to strike with. The fact is, this tendency to despise that which we have not, does not proceed from any genuine, deep, reverent love for that which we have: love *envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not easily puffed up*. The spirit I have been speaking of is

much more nearly akin to that vanity and self-importance, which identifies all its circumstances with itself, and hence regards every deviation from those circumstances as a personal affront and offense. If we English are so notorious among the nations of Europe for our insolent bearing toward foreiners, surely we are no less notorious for our political squabbles and animosities, for our religious feuds and antipathies, and for a general spirit of dissatisfaction at home. Whereas, if our love were rightly principled, and referred its objects to their true source, it would likewise observe its due proportions. While we loved God as the Author and Giver of all our blessings, and were especially thankful to him for all those gifts, which He has poured out so bountifully upon us, and which so far exceed our deserts, we should bear in mind that God has other creatures beside ourselves, whom He likewise loves, and likewise vouchsafes to bless. We should bear in mind that His power of blessing is not stinted, like that of the patriarch, who had only one blessing to give; but that His are manifold, yea, without number and end, infinite as His own infinite Wisdom and Goodness; and that, precious and dear as are those which He bestows upon us, those which He bestows upon others are likewise precious as coming from Him, and dear to the persons to whom He gives them.

This then is one of the main causes of errour, spreading far and wide, through every region of thought and action, —of errour, whereby we entirely miss the harmony and unity of truth, and become involved in endless controversies and contradictions. We have strayed away from the One Divine Universal Centre, and have set up a multitude of arbitrary fictitious centres in its stead; so that each

people has its own centre, each class has its own centre, each party and sect has its own centre, nay, each individual man has his own centre; and that is himself. Hence, inasmuch as we all look out from a different point of view, and yet are persuaded that our point of view is the centre of the universe, we all see all things differently: each people has its own system of truth; each class and party and sect has its own system of truth; each individual man has his own system of truth. This too each will maintain, with pen and sword, or, it may be, with anathemas and *autos da fè*, to be the only true system, and that all others are false and counterfeit. Hereby we all fail of attaining to any right principle of unity. Instead of sailing out, as we might do under the guidance of the heavens, with one consent from all parts of the earth on the same great voyage of discovery after truth, we are broken up and scattered hither and thither, with no other help to steer through the darkness, than the reflexion of our own sternlights in the waters. The very faculties of our minds, which were given to us in divers proportions and combinations, to the end that each might bear its appropriate part in the one great work, being infected with the selfish taint, become propagaters of division, while they contend and jangle with each other for the supremacy. The poet asserts that the imagination is the one ennobling faculty in man, and so loses the substantial ground of reality, and bewilders himself among the clouds. The philosopher worships what he calls reason, and entangles himself in the mazes of formal abstractions. The man of the world can recognize no truth except in the practical understanding dealing with the objects of sense, and thus will run round a ring in

the dreary sandy wilderness of utilitarianism, until at length he sinks down exhausted in some epicurean oasis.

Thus we are come to the second great destroyer of unity, and cause of division. The first is our setting up ourselves, our own will, our own fancies, our own notions, as the centre of the universe, instead of the will and mind of God. The second is our having given up our hearts to the creature, instead of the Creator, our having set our affections on earthly things, which are numberless, vague, fleeting, mob-like, and having drawn them away from heavenly things, which roll in imperturbable unison around the eternal throne. When we changed the glory of the incorruptible God into images made like to corruptible man, and to birds and fourfooted beasts and creeping things, then we lost the source, the principle, the very idea of unity: and as our desires attacht themselves to these things, and our lusts laid hold on them, and our covetousness and ambition tried to seize larger and larger masses of them, they became the occasions of perpetual contention and strife; whence every man's hand and every man's heart was set against his neighbour.

Nor is this division and contrariety merely a division and contrariety between man and man: a like division and contrariety and struggle is found in the heart and soul of each man. When we fell away from God, our hearts and souls were crackt and rent in twain by the violence of the fall. Hence, when we look into ourselves, instead of concord and unity, we see the dark chasm of sin cleaving the soul asunder; and whithersoever we look out of ourselves, we see the reflexion of it stretching across both earth and heaven. Sin, the universal solvent,

breaks up the heart and the mind into a multitude of insulated faculties and feelings; and since its first essential act was the rejection of law,—which is the outward bond, as love is the inward principle, of all union,—it can behold nothing but isolation and desolation around it. Nay, in its audacity it even dared to dissolve the unity of the Divine Idea into a multitude of fictitious deities, deeming nothing too base, nothing too foul, nothing too depraved, to be seated on a throne in the heavens. Thus man was lured and dragged so far away from the only true principle of unity, that he plunged into all the extravagances and all the abominations of Polytheism. Or, if some more thoughtful men, meditating on the traces of unity still left in their own minds, became desirous of seeing a counterpart of that unity in the outward world, they forgot what had marred that unity; they forgot that evil of every kind is utterly incompatible with unity, and destructive of it; and so, in shrinking from the fantastical and revolting absurdities of Polytheism, they fell back into the dead blank of Pantheism.

By these two causes, which pervade and taint all the workings of our fallen being, the desire of unity, which is inherent in man according to the idea of his nature, is thwarted and hindered from realizing itself either in thought or in action. When God said, *The Lord thy God is one God*, the true principle of all unity was proclaimed to mankind: but from this unity man had turned away, when he gave himself up to the love and worship of self, and to the love and worship of the creature. There is still indeed a principle of unity in our understanding, the part of our nature which has suffered the least from the Fall; and by this principle, as we have seen already,

its movements, whether consciously or unconsciously, are swayed and regulated: but all manner of principles of division sprout out of our will, and our ill-governed affections and passions. These, if they were allowed to run riot, would tear the world to tatters; and only by a hard, persevering struggle has the principle of unity been able from the beginning to keep these principles of division in check. It has united men into families: it has united families into nations; it has organized nations into a kind of unity under the authority of one ruling head: it has tried to bind the tumultuous wills and passions of the multitude by the chains of law. The history of these struggles with their various vicissitudes forms the history of the world. The only unity however, that man could attain to in this way, is the negative, outward, abstract, formal unity of the understanding, which masses its objects together by overlooking or repressing whatever individualizes and would keep them apart,—the unity of unicity and of uniformity,—not the unity which discerns the divine central principle in them, and is no way embarrast by the endless variety of its manifestations, but rather rejoices therein, even as we rejoice when we look at the infinite diversity of the constellations in the one starry sky. In families indeed, where the spirit of love has always found the freest play, some approximations have from time to time been made to this higher unity, recognizing the individuality of each several member: but in states almost the only object of governments has been to repress that which would violate unity; and Law has mostly recognized that its office is purely negative, and that its appropriate voice is *Thou shalt not*. When it has aimed at anything beyond this, when it has attempted by human

means to build a tower the top of which should reach to heaven, and which should be a positive centre of union for mankind, the result has proved that it was passing out of its sphere: the band, which was strained too far, has burst; and, instead of unity, there has issued from the attempt multiplied and widened division.

These two causes of division, by which the Spirit of Evil contrived to mar the divine unity of the universe, so far as man has power to do so,—selfwill and the lust of the creature,—have been busy ever since the Fall at their Satanic work, breeding and fostering division and strife; and they are scarcely less busy or less powerful in these days than in the worst times of old. That the selfish principle is still dismally active, we see by divisions even in that Church, which was meant by God to be the reuniter and harmonizer of the world; we see it by all manner of divisions in the State, by divisions in every parish, and almost in every household. Everywhere we find an exaggerated estimate of each man's peculiar habits and usages and opinions, and a grievous want of deference and forbearance toward others, an utter want of that reverence which every man has a right to claim for such doctrines and feelings as are sacred in the eyes of his conscience. All men are convinced that they are thoroughly right, even in the notions and views which they have taken up the most lightly and unreflectingly; and they have just force of logic to draw the inference, which they deem inevitable, that everybody who differs from them must be wrong. Nor is the solvent, insulating power of that delusion, by which man gave up his heart and soul to the things of this world, less powerful or less efficacious than in former ages. Still too it produces the same

fruits,—on the one side Polytheism, or the idolatrous worship of the creature, and of everything about it that fascinates and intoxicates the senses, only stript of that imaginative halo which in some measure elevated the Polytheism of old,—and on the other side Pantheism, with its fatal denial of moral responsibility, its obliteration of the distinction between right and wrong, and its blind prostration before every phantom of power. More especially has this been manifested in the leveling, anarchal spirit, which has been so overweening in the last and in this generation. For Jacobinism is the form which Pantheism naturally takes in political life, when it is not restrained by those feelings and principles of a higher origin, which its more enlightened advocates practically recognize, even while they speculatively reject them. In the civil state, as in the universe, it is anarchal; and having cast away all moral distinctions, and the only true principles of law and order, it would also destroy all civil distinctions, and everything that bears witness to law and order, and to the permanence of rights, in the constitution of society. Surely every one who hears me must be aware in what terrible forms these aboriginal deadly heresies are still shewing themselves, even in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, even in England, which deems itself the favorite seat of all practical wisdom and moral truth.

Now with regard to both these causes we have seen, that the primary reason why they have hindered man from attaining to unity is, that, when he gave himself up to their influence, he abandoned the only true Principle of Unity, and fell away from that Centre, whence alone all things can be seen working together and at one. Thus, whithersoever we look abroad over the earth, if we look

only with the eyes of our natural understanding, we behold nothing like unity and concord, but variety, diversity, multiplicity, contrariety, discord. And if we look into ourselves, into our own hearts and minds, at the utmost we see a crowd of reluctant faculties, bound together in some few men by the iron hoops of a stern will, but much oftener scattered about, and running confusedly to and fro. What then are we to do, in order that we may fulfill our inherent desire of unity? whither are we to go, that we may find a true principle of unity? how are the dashing waves of the world to be quelled and husht? how are the clashing elements of human nature to be harmonized and set at one? To these questions there is only one answer; and that is to be found in those words of the Apostle, which I read to you at the beginning of this Sermon: *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one Hope of your calling: one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*

As it was in falling away from God that man lost the principle of unity, so it could only be through his being brought back to God, that that principle could be revived within him. He needed to be reconciled to God: he needed to be set at one with God, or atoned. He needed, as we have seen, a twofold atonement: for, as his separation from God had been followed by division within himself, he needed at the same time to be set at one with God, and to be set at one within himself. The manner in which this great work was to be effected, the only way in which it ever was or ever can be effected, is set before us in these words of St Paul. What sublime and wonderful words they are! The Apostle lookt out over the face of the

earth; and what did he see? Nation warring against nation, faction against faction, school against school, man against man, struggling passions, battling interests, plots, snares, fraud, rapacious avarice, insatiable ambition, with the Roman empire waving its sword over the heads of mankind, and awing them into servile torpour, while voluptuousness had relaxt all the traditionary bonds of virtue and moral obligation, so that human nature seemed to be almost crumbling to atoms, or floating like ragged scum on the surface of hell. Even among his own countrymen there were endless dissensions, unceasing feuds. Countless swarms of bodies met the eye; but no spirit breathed life into them. Everything like a spirit that had animated the nations in earlier ages, and infused some sort of unity into them, had fled away. And yet the Apostle, casting his glance over the world, seeing what was not to be seen, and feeling an undoubting assurance of that of which no token appeared, dared to say, *There is one Body, and one Spirit.*

For though these words were addrest primarily to the Christian converts at Ephesus, to certify them that they had been called to a participation in this one Body and this one Spirit, it cannot well be questioned that he, to whom, above all the Apostles, was vouchsafed the glorious vision of the reception and indwelling of the nations in the Body of Christ, — he whose special mission it was to declare that the wall of partition had been taken away, and that there should no longer be Jew or Greek, circumcision or uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, male or female,—that is, that no distinction of nationality, of customs or rites, of civilization, of social condition, or of sex, should in any way obstruct the perfect union and unity of those among whom these distinctions subsisted,—so that,

notwithstanding these distinctions, Christ should be all, and in all, and that through His indwelling they should all be one,—it cannot be questioned that here also the Apostle of the Gentiles was contemplating the reception of all mankind into the one holy Body of Christ. This is the one Body he speaks of: he saw that Christ's Church was to be one Body; and it was to be one Body, because it was to be animated by one Spirit: for thus alone do the material elements of our fleshly bodies become one, through the one living spirit that animates and pervades and organizes them; and when that living spirit has past away, they moulder into dust. But Christ's Church was indeed to be one Body, because it was to be animated by one Spirit, even the Holy Spirit of God, whom the Father sent down from heaven to dwell for ever in the hearts of all such as believe in His Onlybegotten Son. This too is the one hope of our calling, the sanctifying presence of the one Spirit, obtained for us by the merits and intercession of the Eternal Son.

Such, the Apostle saw, was to be the perfect unity of the Church, according to the will of God, who from the beginning purpost to shew forth His own Unity, no less than His own fulness, in the whole created universe. The Church was to be one Body, and one Spirit, one Body animated by the one Spirit of God, according to the one blessed Hope whereunto it had been called, by Him who became incarnate to this end, that all mankind might gather around His all-atoning Cross. We were to be restored to the Unity, which we had forsaken and forfeited. We were to be brought back to the One Eternal Principle of Unity, who is above all, and through all, and who also purpost to be in us all. This however could not be done

immediately. We had turned away from God; we had hidden ourselves from Him; and when He called to us, we fled and hid ourselves more and more in the deep, sunless, pathless forest of the world; we hid ourselves in the groves of an idolatrous Polytheism. To the Jews indeed God had revealed Himself in His Unity. *Hear, O Israel*, He had declared, *the Lord thy God is one Lord.* He had declared also, what followed of necessity from this His eternal Unity, that we, His reasonable creatures, being endowed with the faculty of knowing Him, were bound to love our one God *with all our heart and with all our soul and with all our mind.* But this we could not do with the simplicity and integrity of unbroken innocence: we could not do it even with the entireness with which a child gives its heart to its parents. For we had given up our hearts to the things of this world; and the world had fixt its fangs into them; and we could not free them, except by tearing them away; nor could this be done without blood. Hence the Jews could only approach God through the Law, every command of which was designed, as it were, to free men's hearts from the fangs of the world, to loosen one of the nails whereby man was fastened to the cross of this world. Moreover, as man's departure from the one God was caused by his giving up his heart to the things of this world, God ordained that men should bring offerings of the things of this world to Him, both as an acknowledgement that He was the Lord of the whole material world, no less than of mankind, and as a token that they were bound and were willing to make sacrifice of the things of this world, whereby they had been withdrawn from their communion with the one God, in order that they might be received again into that communion And as every act of obedience to the Law was

a binding and resigning of selfwill, and every offering was a giving up of the things of this world, so these latter sacrifices further shewed that the former in themselves were incomplete, and required a higher purificatory and sanctificatory power to make up for their deficiencies. They declared that man's obedience by itself could never take away sin; and while his reason and conscience pronounced that the higher could never be purified and sanctified by the lower, and accordingly that the blood of bulls and rams could not take away sin, they were a witness to him that he needed a purification and sanctification beyond himself, and carried his thoughts and hopes and desires onward to the fulfilment of that which they typified and foreshewed.

Thus the one God could not be approacht by the Jews, except through the works of the Law, and through typical sacrifices; and therefore He further declared Himself to be a Consuming Fire. For by the works of the Law no man can approach to God: no man could do so then; no man can do so now. If any man fancies he can approach to God by the works of the Law, the Law is still like the flaming sword of the Cherubim, turning every way, and keeping the way of the Tree of Life. The action of law, as law, is outward, and, if it produces any manner of unity, can only effect this forcibly, by destroying what resists it, and fusing things into one mass. Nor can any man really approach to God by means of types and ordinances, or anything symbolical; he could not then,—nor can he now, —unless he has already been brought nigh to God by the Spirit, enabling him to look through that outward veil, which has ever been so apt to arrest his sight, and to prevent his discerning what lies beyond and behind it. And

thus it came to pass here again, that men lost sight of the Divine Principle of Unity in the multiplicity of commands and observances: here again they turned from the worship of the Creator to the idolatry of the creature, from the reverent, self-sacrificing service of the Lawgiver to the disputatious, self-justifying observance of particular ordinances and ceremonies. For there is but one way in which we can really be brought back to the One God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and who dwells in all His servants; and that way is through the one Lord who has reconciled us to God,—through the one Faith in Him, whereby we receive Him into us,—and through the one Baptism, whereby we are purged from those sins which keep us away from Him, and are made partakers of the gift of the one sanctifying indwelling Spirit.

Through Christ, and through Him alone, we have power given to us to approach to the one God and Father of all. He is the Fulfilment of the Law, so that the Law shall no longer keep us away from God, entangled in its meshes. He is likewise the Fulfilment of the types and rites, so that, after we have beheld His glory, we can no longer be deluded by phantoms and shadows into mistaking them for realities. When He was lifted up on high, He was to draw all men to Him, teaching them by the lesson of His cross, that they were to draw nigh to God, not by this work or that work, not by the sacrifice of this thing or that thing,—for that all partial obedience and service left them in their state of disunion and separation,—but by the entire sacrifice and resignation of their whole being to the will of God. In Him, the one Lord, the invisible Godhead dwelt visibly upon earth: in Him, the second Adam, the divine image was renewed, to be communicated

to the fallen race sprung from the first Adam. In Him, the one Head, and through Him, the Church becomes one Body, and receives the one Spirit to abide in it.

And how are we made partakers of the Unity which Christ came to bring back to us? By Faith; by the one Faith, whereby we receive Him into our hearts as our Saviour, as our Mediator, as our Atonement, as the one Incarnate God, through whom our human nature is restored to its communion with the divine; by that Faith, which, according to our Lord's last command, was to precede the baptismal purification and renewal of the believer.

But while we continue under the dominion of sin, and under the condemnation incurred by it, Faith is almost powerless. The moment the eyes of Faith are unsealed, it recognizes its own blindness and feebleness: its first utterance is, *Help my unbelief.* Therefore, in order to vivify our Faith, our one Lord instituted His one Baptism, the Baptism in the name of the one undivided Trinity, wherein by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body.

Thus, being led by our one Lord, and united to Him by one Faith, and incorporated into His Body by one Baptism, we are enabled to approach to the one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.

These then, we are authorized to declare, are the essential, indispensable principles of Unity in that Body of Christ, which is ordained to embrace all nations and kindreds and languages. And the Unity thus infused into us is to be maintained by that Communion in the Body of Christ, wherein, as the Bread is one, we, being many, become one Body. Without these there can be no unity. Without

these we cannot be reunited to God; and therefore we cannot have any stable principle of unity, powerful enough to calm and harmonize the discordant elements of our nature, and to sway the course of our lives among the manifold forces which would drive us this way and that. But when we are brought nigh to God in this manner, we are no longer left to the various precepts of the Law, which merely teach us to coast the skirts of the land of Duty. The one principle of Love, which alone fulfills the Law, and which spreads and branches out through our whole being, as the living source of a diviner law, is revealed to us; and under its calm and mighty impulses we may sail across the wide ocean, and circumnavigate the globe.

These are the living principles of unity in the Church, whereby the Church is made one with her Lord: these are the primary pervading principles of that unity; and beside these there are no other such. Other ordinances and institutions may be valuable in a secondary and instrumental manner, for the sake of preserving the unity of the Church unimpaired in the midst of an unfriendly and often hostile world,—with a view to the transmission of the one Faith and the one Baptism in their uncorrupted purity from generation to generation,—or in order to the maintenance of order and discipline. But these primary essential principles of unity are to be kept studiously distinct from whatever is secondary and accidental, however important and valuable as an accident. From all such things the principles enumerated by the Apostle are to be carefully distinguisht,—the one Faith, and the one Baptism, whereby we become members of the one Body of our one Lord,

animated by the one Spirit of promise, and thus are brought home and reconciled to the one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in us all.

Nor is this caution superfluous. For as through the whole history of man prior to the birth of Christ we find a universal proneness to substitute the idolatry of the creature for the worship of the Creator,—a proneness betraying its carnal origin by its readiness and zeal in prostrating itself before objects physically the meanest and morally the most corrupt,—in like manner since the birth of Christ, and the setting up of His Church as the antagonist of the world, that Church has in all ages been grievously troubled and disordered by a similar proneness to look at the outward instead of the inward, to set up the secondary on a level with, if not above, the primary, and to cling more tenaciously and passionately to the formal than to the spiritual. This was the case from the very first: the Jews wisht to Judaize the whole Church: so in after times did the Romans wish to Romanize it: much reason therefore have we to beware lest we be infected with a desire of Anglicizing the whole Church, lest we be reluctant to recognize and acknowledge the Church of the Lord, unless her whole stature and gait and garb be exactly the same as we ourselves are familiar with. The contest against this narrow selfish spirit within the Church was a main part of the mission assigned to the great Apostle of the Gentiles: and from him may we best learn to discriminate between those institutions and ordinances which may vary with time and place and national habits and condition, and those principles which are set before us in the text, and without which none can truly be members of the one Body, or animated by the one Spirit.

The time will not allow me to enforce these remarks by the citation of particular instances, in which false conditions of unity have been set up as indispensable in the Church, and which might need some investigation to explain their fallacy, and to trace their mischievous effects. I can do no more than refer to that one instance, which has been the most conspicuous and the most calamitous. And surely you will already have anticipated me in casting your minds back on that period of many centuries, during which the Church of Christ was not content with her one Lord, and her one Faith, and her one Baptism, but, having almost let slip that one Faith in her one invisible Lord, deemed it requisite to have a visible Head, and set up her one Bishop in the same category with her one Lord. Alas, too, we know that this dismal errour is still holding captive a very large part of Christendom, benumbing the spirit, as its natural consequence, with a load of ceremonial and ritual observances, and strengthening the carnal tendency to elevate the outward and visible above the inward and invisible. And though the blessed Reformation was sent by God to redeem the Church from this idolatry, the propensities by which it had been corrupted, were not eradicated thereby, but have shot up from time to time, admonishing us that it is absolutely necessary, so long as we continue in our earthly tabernacle, that we should watch and pray diligently and assiduously against all idolatries, whether of the flesh or of the carnal understanding. So momentous is that lesson, with which the beloved disciple closes his Epistle, a lesson which at first we might incline to think belonged solely to long extinct ages, but which, foreseeing what an ever-sprouting crop of idolatries would in all ages contend with the love of Christ, and try

to supplant it in the hearts of His professing followers, he bequeathed with the emphasis of last words to the Church, *Little children, keep yourselves from idols.* Assuredly too we have great need of this lesson in our days,—no age ever had greater,—although by different classes it is needed in different, and almost opposite directions. For while the world is rioting unrestrainedly in numberless kinds of idolatry,—in the idolatry of the flesh, in the idolatry of Mammon, in the idolatry of machinery, in the idolatry of power, in the idolatry of the gifts of the understanding, and of the works of the understanding, in the idolatry of luxury and ease and comfort, and in every other form of the idolatry of self,—at the same time, in order to counteract these grosser worldly idolatries, which have been sprouting up in these latter years no less rankly than the giants were fabled of old to have sprung out of the first teeming throes of the elements, it has been ordained that we should return, after a long period of indifference and laxity, to a higher appreciation of whatever is valuable and venerable in the institutions and ordinances of the Church. Hence we are again exposed to a danger, which is more formidable to the Church than all the idolatries of the world, because it paralyses the arm wherewith we are to combat and cast down those idolatries,—the danger of cherishing new or antiquated forms of idolatry within our own bosom; the more so as the very impetus of a rebound is apt to carry people into an opposite excess; while they seem to themselves to be merely discharging a debt, in fondling and exaggerating what has been unduly neglected and depreciated. Thus we are especially likely to revive the old errour of placing other conditions of unity on a par with the apostolic principles, the one Faith and

the one Baptism, whereby, through the power of the one Spirit, we are incorporated into the one Body of Christ, and reconciled by Him to the one God and Father of all.

For still the selfish spirit is at work, and as busy as ever. The self-glorifying negative spirit, which magnifies all the circumstances of its own condition, and despises and condemns whatever differs from them, is quite as active in this generation, as in the most narrowminded of those that have past away; and in no country does it exercise a greater sway than in England. We are still very apt to believe that God made and redeemed the world for us only, not for us along with the rest of His Church, but merely for us, and for those who agree with us, so far as they do agree with us. Still in the stiffness of our minds we find it hard to conceive how unity can mean anything but unicity; whereas the higher idea of unity is that which is identical with universality or catholicity. The one Church, which is the one Body animated by the one Spirit, is the universal catholic Church, comprising all who are united to Christ by the one Faith in Him, and the one Baptism ordained by Him; even as the One God and Father of all, who is above all, is also through all, and in us all. We know how it ever has been, and still is a great stumblingblock to the understanding to recognize the mysterious union of the Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead. The understanding can comprehend one, as a unit standing by itself, but not as unity embracing the fulness of all things; whereas the unity of the Church is a divine unity, the unity of infinite fulness. Therefore St Paul, after the verses in which he speaks of the unity of the Church, and of the principles and conditions of that unity, goes on to declare, that this unity of the Church implies a diversity

of gifts: *But to each one of us is given grace according to the measure in which Christ gives it.* And then, having set forth the great power and glory of Him from whom these manifold gifts come, how they came from Him who had ascended up on high, and led captivity captive, and who thereby shewed that He had previously come from the place whither He reascended, *far above all heavens, that He might fill all things*, St Paul goes on to enumerate some of the gifts which He had given to His Church: *He gave some to be apostles,—and some, prophets,—and some, evangelists,—and some, pastors and teachers,—for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, until we all come to the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God, to perfect manhood, to the state when Christ shall be fully formed in our hearts.*

In selecting this subject, brethren, as one which would be appropriate for this occasion of our solemn meeting, I was chiefly influenced by the reflexion that the purpose for which this meeting is assembled, the purpose for which our Association was originally establisht, was to realize, and in some measure to fulfill that unity, to which the Church of Christ is called, that unity which, so far as the Church is indeed the Body of Christ, must needs be one of its chief characteristics. The bands of that unity had been sadly relaxt. Slender evidence was to be seen in our Church, during the last century, of the one Body that it ought to have been,—still slenderer of the one Spirit that ought to have animated it. For why! it held but loosely to the one Faith: it had many faiths, if that word would admit of plurality: each man had his own faith, more or less remote from that which unites the Body of Christ to its Head, a faith in many lords, of whom Christ might be

one, and perhaps nominally the chief. Hence men, having lost the one centre of unity and of union, sought to unite around other centres of their own devising. Many asserted that interest was the only true centre of human nature, that it was the living centre of every man's heart, and that a clever conjuror might make it a centre whereby nations also might be held together. Others brought forward some fantastical or fanatical maxim as a principle of union. Instead of clustering round centres of love, people coagulated round centres of hatred. Their watchword was *Death to all who will not join us.* Of these conspiracies and combinations there were many at the close of the last century; and the same combining spirit is wofully active in this land now. Men combine to carry some scheme of their own, to realize some notion, to enforce some union. They are rightly convinced that strength lies in union; but not knowing the only living principles of union, they fail of attaining to it. So too must all fail, so must the statecraftsmen of our days fail, who deem they can hold men together by the ties of interest. The principles and feelings which united men in days of old, patriotism, loyalty, the love of freedom, were living principles, and had a power over the heart and soul: they gave men a centre out of themselves, and attacht them thereto. Thus they had force to suppress and almost extinguish lesser personal motives, and to make men encounter hardships, submit to sacrifices, exercise selfdenial. But interest has no power to awaken any heroic feeling: it can extract no sacrifices, no selfdenial; or, if it does, they are a mere mockery. Therefore the attempt, which is accounted the consummation of modern wisdom, to render a people obedient to the laws by convincing them that it is their

interest to be so, is like binding the strong man with withes, which anon he starts up and rends asunder. Most thankful indeed should we be that this is so,—that interest has not the power to curb man's will, and to tame his passions,—that his nature, in spite of its corruption, is still too noble to sink quietly into such abject bondage. We should give God thanks that no earthly motive can bind men lastingly together, and that selfishness cannot do otherwise than sever them, from the first in heart and spirit, and sooner or later in act also: for terrible would be the power of evil, if it did not thus contain the germs of its own dissolution. We should give God thanks that it is impossible for men to be cemented in a lasting indissoluble union by any feebler power than the Love which proceeds from Him, and which the One Spirit infuses into the One Body of Christ.

But while men are combining on all sides for worldly, and not seldom for plainly evil and lawless purposes, the Church also has been reminded of her own unity, has been roused out of her languid torpour, has been bracing her limbs anew, and gathering her members together. As her principle is unity, her form ought to be union; and it is only by and through the union of her members that her great ends can be accomplisht, this union itself being one of the first and greatest, as is proved by the earnest desire for it exprest in her Lord's last prayer. Hence in the early ages of the Church, when the One Spirit was poured out with that abundance which was indispensable for the work of establishing her foundations, men were so entirely delivered from their inborn selfishness, that they laid their possessions at the feet of the Apostles, deeming the whole of their substance a slight return for

the priceless blessings which they had received. *And the multitude of them that believed*, the Evangelist tells us, *were of one heart and one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possest was his own; but they had all things common. And continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they ate their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.* In this simple account we see what perfect unity the love of Christ ought to produce in His disciples, and how this unity ought to manifest itself, by the removal and giving up of everything whereby men in their natural state are kept asunder. Now it is as an attempt to renew something like this feeling of unity in the One Body of Christ, to revive a faint and distant likeness of this union, that we rejoice and are thankful for the establishment of our Association. It is merely a beginning, a first attempt, a very remote approximation, but still it is an attempt to lead the members of our Church in this Diocese, all her members, lay as well as clerical, to feel that they are indeed members of the One Body of Christ, to lead them to feel that, as such, it behoves them to help and minister to each other, that, as such, they ought not to live to themselves, but to each other and to God. The spirit of Charity, as manifesting itself in noble works to the glory of God, and in a largehearted bounty to the poor, had waxt faint in the land. The spirit of Mammon had become so powerful, and had wrestled so mightily and craftily against it, and had assailed it with such an ever-increasing swarm of luxuries and vanities, that Charity was hardly able to lift up its head. Even the rich, if they gave a few shillings now and then in casual alms, and subscribed their yearly guinea to one or two

beneficent institutions, deemed that they had fulfilled their duty. And are there not many who think so still? are there not many who even fall short of this? Meanwhile few had a notion that it behoved them to relieve any other than the grosser physical wants of their neighbours: moral and spiritual wants were scarcely taken count of by the great majority of those to whose stewardship the riches of England had been committed. And the pious men, who effected so much in the latter part of the last, and at the beginning of this century, for the revival of a higher spiritual life in England, as their views of religion revolved almost entirely about the wants and hopes of the individual soul, and as they found little answerable to their own feelings in the main body of our Church, although they were zealous, as every true Christian must be, to promote charitable works, were thus led by circumstances, as well as by the peculiar character of their religion, to form societies composed of unconnected individuals, who took an interest in the furtherance of godliness, from all parts of the country. But as these societies emanated from persons invested with no ecclesiastical authority, they could not be connected with our ecclesiastical organization: nor could they take advantage of the means afforded by our ecclesiastical system for bringing home the duties of Christian liberality to every member of the English Church. Now this is the end which our Association is designed to accomplish. It addresses itself to the whole body of the Church in this Diocese: it desires to embrace every member of the Church, all who have anything to give for the promotion of God's glory in the well-being of His people, and all who have any spiritual want to be relieved. Its object, according to

the purpose of its pious and benevolent founder, is to remind us that the members of Christ have not merely bodies, but souls also, to be taken care of, souls to be trained from their childhood in the knowledge and love of God, souls to be fed with the bread of life, when they come to maturity. It admonishes us of these wants, and tells us that it is a momentous part of our duty, and that we ought to esteem it a blessed part of our Christian privileges, to contribute of our substance, so that Christ's poor may not perish for lack of those blessings which He came to give them.

Toward the accomplishment of these works something has been done already; a beginning has been made; and therefore we rejoice. But we trust that it is only a beginning; or our joy will be turned into sorrow. We trust that we are to mount from strength to strength; else we shall sink from strength to weakness. Every undertaking has a period of bloom in its spring; the novelty awakens an interest; the energy of the founder imparts itself to those around him. But the novelty passes away, and with it the excitement; the energy, which was merely caught from the reflexion of another's, fades: and unless there is some higher principle to uphold it, the undertaking gradually and not slowly decays. Therefore are we met together in the house of God today, to confess the one Faith, whereby we are united to our one Lord, and to seek access through Him to the One God and Father of all. As by the One Baptism we have been incorporated into the One Body of Christ, we are assembled to profess ourselves members of that One Body, and to pray for a more plenteous outpouring of the One Spirit upon ourselves and upon the whole Church, so that we

may indeed be living members of Christ's Body, knit together by love, and ministering to each other in lowliness and joy. We are assembled together after the example of the first Christians, who *continued daily with one accord in the temple:* and would it not be well that we should follow their example still further, by *breaking bread*, so that we might be strengthened for our work of charity by the spiritual nourishment of the Body and Blood of the Saviour? As there is no perfect union without communion, would it not be well that, on this only occasion when the whole Diocese is gathered together in the presence of its spiritual Father, for works of charity and for the edifying of the Church, we should perfect our feeling of unity by Communion at the Table of the Lord?

Moreover, if we are indeed One Body, if we desire and trust that One Spirit is animating us, if we have set One Hope of our calling before us, what manner of men ought we to be in all our dealings with each other? How ought we to speak of each other? How ought we to think of each other? Brethren, I beseech you, ponder this thought. If we are indeed One Body in Christ, and animated by the One Holy Spirit of God, ought we not likewise to be of one heart and of one soul and of one mind! And yet there are dissensions and divisions amongst us; and yet there are parties in the Church. Contradictory as the words are, there are parties in that Church, which calls itself, and ought to be, the One Body of Christ. Consider what it is, when there are divisions in the body, when limb is torn from limb, when a gash is hewn across the trunk. Does not the body perish? So too must it be, after a kind at least, with the Church.

A divided Church cannot be the One Body, cannot be animated by the One Spirit of Christ. It may indeed happen that a wound will at times prove salutary to a diseased body: the morbid humours may gather in it, and escape through it. But the wound must not continue to fester, or the body dies. When the Church was grown torpid, the revival of animation might unavoidably be accompanied by some convulsive throes: it might again be necessary, as of old, that He who came to send peace, should begin by sending a sword: but His desire and purpose was to send peace. Though the tumultuous tossing and raging of the waves is better than stagnation, that tossing also is only to be for a time. The Sun of Righteousness cannot be mirrored in that tossing: He can only be mirrored in the calm and peace of the waters. Let us then earnestly seek peace through Him, the peace which He alone can give, the peace which proceeds from His righteousness, which is given to all such as are made partakers of His righteousness, the peace which sets us at one with the One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all; which peace if we have, we must needs be at peace also with each other. To Him, in the Unity of the eternal Trinity, be glory in the Church throughout all ages, in earth and in heaven, world without end.

The line of argument in the early part of this Sermon is very like that pursued by Mr Gladstone in the second chapter of his work *On the State in its relations with the Church*, §§ 13—18; and several of the illustrations are the same. Indeed when I was reading the last edition of Mr Gladstone's book, after my Sermon had been printed, I was so struck by the similarity, that I fancied some unconscious reminiscence of his argument must have been working in my mind: nor was I convinced of the contrary, until I found that the passage referred to is not in Mr Gladstone's first edition, and that my Sermon had been preacht before the publication of his fourth edition. This may serve as a warning against the common proneness to bring forward charges of plagiarism. Numberless similar instances might be produced from writers of the same school in every age of literature; and though my mind has in many respects been trained in a different school from Mr Gladstone's, I believe he would join me in acknowledging the highest obligations to Coleridge, as one of our chief masters of thought.

A LETTER

TO

THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER

ON THE APPOINTMENT OF DR HAMPDEN

TO THE SEE OF HEREFORD.

A LETTER

TO THE VERY REVEREND

THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER,

ON THE AGITATION EXCITED BY THE APPOINTMENT

OF DR HAMPDEN

TO THE SEE OF HEREFORD.

BY

JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES.

SECOND EDITION, WITH A POSTSCRIPT,

ON LORD JOHN RUSSELL'S LETTER TO THE CLERGY OF BEDFORD,

AND IN REPLY TO MR TROWER'S PLAIN REMARKS.

LONDON:

JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND:

SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

1848.

London:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley, Wilson, and Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

TO THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

My dear Dean,

You wrote to me a fortnight ago, to inform me of certain measures which the Chapter of Chichester were about to take with the view of endeavouring to avert the appointment of Dr Hampden to the See of Hereford; and you seemed to wish that I should propose some similar measure to the Clergy in the Archdeaconry of Lewes. When we met two days after in the Convocation, you spoke to me on the same subject. My answer was, that, having never read any of Dr Hampden's writings, I should feel it my duty beforehand to examine them, especially his Bampton Lectures, which are the main ground of the charges brought against him, in order to make out whether they do indeed contain sufficient reason for doing, what, at all events, must imply a grave condemnation of a person who had for eleven years filled the first theological chair in one of our Universities. Since then I have returned a like answer to similar applications, which have been addrest to me by clergymen in this Archdeaconry. To my surprise, my answer has seemed in some cases to surprise the applicants. Yet what other answer could a person return, who had any sense of the solemn responsibility incurred by such a proceeding, and knew that he

was called to do justly, and to love mercy, in all the relations of life, whether private or public? Even after the sad experience which half a century has yielded me, of the manner in which men's actions are swayed, not by conscientious principles, but mostly by prejudices taken up almost at hazard, it has astonisht me to see how thousands,—I am afraid I do not exaggerate,—invested with the ministry of the Gospel, the ministry of love and reconciliation, have on this occasion rusht forward with blind, reckless impetuosity, to do what they could to condemn and crush a brother. Surely in such a matter we ought to act cautiously, deliberately, reluctantly. We ought to be slow in admitting a conviction, which brands a brother as a heretic, instead of running forward with breathless haste to embrace it.

I have been told indeed, that the addresses and remonstrances and protests of the Clergy do not involve a positive condemnation of Dr Hampden, but merely call for an enquiry to ascertain the real tendency of his writings, and that such a demand is amply warranted by the condemnation he has twice received from a majority of the Convocation at Oxford. This however is far from adequately expressing the bent of that spirit, which is now agitating our Church, and leading so many of our brethren into courses almost unprecedented; while dark threats are thrown out of ulterior, still more violent proceedings. The very demand for an enquiry in such a case, and such a tone, almost presumes a condemnation. Nor does it seem to me at all becoming our clerkly character, to pin our faith blindly to the tail of any extraneous decision, least of all to that of such a body as the Convocation of Oxford. For how many of the four hundred and seventy-four judges who assembled to condemn Dr Hampden in 1836, can we believe to have come with any competent

knowledge of the subject matter on which they were about to pronounce? Would it not be a large allowance to assume that one in ten did so? that one in ten had examined Dr Hampden's writings with that careful, candid, impartial scrutiny, which ought to precede a judicial verdict? that one in ten knew much more of Dr Hampden than what he had gathered from the extracts selected, in whatsoever manner, by some of his most zealous opponents? Yet what but shame would be the doom of a judge in any legal court, who should give sentence on a single *ex parte* statement of the cause? What then can we say of those who think fit to follow at the heels of such ill-qualified judges, except that they are the blind following the blind, and thus cannot by any possibility go right? This conclusion seems to result of necessity from the constitution of such a court as the Convocation of Oxford, when it assumes the right of condemning persons as heretics. And he who has observed the occurrences at that University during the last fifteen years, must have perceived that they are markt, not only by the violence, but no less by the variableness and waywardness, which are the characteristics of a popular tribunal. They who ostracize Themistocles one year, are ready to ostracize Aristides the next. The only way to prevent such alternations, such changeful gusts of party-feeling, which are nowhere more unbecoming, nay, scandalous and mischievous, than on the judgement-seat, is, that all judicial questions, above all, questions so difficult and complicated as those of heresy, requiring so much historical research, so much philosophical and theological knowledge, and such an impartial weighing of every word in its connexion, not only with the immediate context, but also with the general purport of a work, should be tried before a special court, properly constituted for the purpose,

where they may be certain of meeting with a calm, deliberate, full investigation. And here it is natural to ask, why, if Dr Hampden's heresies are so manifest, as they must needs be deemed by those who are passing such a summary condemnation on him, why has the charge of heresy never been brought against him before the proper Ecclesiastical Court? Why has he been allowed to discharge his office for eleven years, inoculating our students of divinity with his heretical doctrines, when his opponents, who burn with such zeal for the preservation of orthodoxy, might at any time, if their charges were legally tenable, have ensured his condemnation and consequent deprivation? This can hardly have arisen from any over-indulgent forbearance on their part, but seems to imply, that, however confident they were in their assertions, they had a strong suspicion that they should fail in making out a case against him.

Nor, for my own part, do I understand why such a course should not be adopted now. If Dr Hampden has indeed been guilty of heresy, let him be proceeded against according to the regular forms of our Ecclesiastical Law. This is a simple and easy course, honest and straightforward; and we may feel sure that Dr Hampden would not attempt to baffle such proceedings by mere technical objections. It would greatly add to his peace of mind, if the question were thus set at rest. But I cannot see why the whole Church should be convulst from the Land's End to Newcastle, why every minister in every parish should be disturbed in the quiet discharge of his pastoral duties, in order to call upon the Crown to institute such an enquiry. Is it wisht that Dr Hampden should indict himself for heresy? or is the Crown to do so? But the Crown, by the very act of its appointment, has declared that it does not believe him to be chargeable with any such offense.

The task of indicting him should surely fall on those who do believe him guilty, not on those who do not.

On the grounds above stated, I felt that I could not exonerate myself from my own personal responsibility in this matter, by throwing it off upon the decision of the University of Oxford. Moreover, if we call to mind when that decision was first past, and what was the state of feeling in our Church, especially among the Clergy, at that time,—how, for several years after the conflicts of the Reform Bill, political party-spirit seemed to sway all minds, to the casting overboard of candour and discretion, until it was gradually superseded by ecclesiastical and theological party-spirit,—how almost everybody was so agitated and warpt by political and ecclesiastical anxieties, by fears, first of the overthrow of the Constitution, and then of the overthrow of the Church, as to be almost incapacitated for a calm estimate of the theological opinions held by a political and ecclesiastical opponent,—when we call to mind that he, whose name now stands higher perhaps in the esteem and admiration and reverence of England, than any other man of our generation, my dear and magnanimous friend Dr Arnold, was in those days a butt for all manner of scurrilous reproach, poured out upon him by none so profusely as by his clerical brethren,—when we call to mind, I say, what injustice was committed by the same class of persons at the selfsame time in the case of Dr Arnold, it cannot be invidious to think that the verdict which was then past on a friend of Dr Arnold's, may now need revision.

At all events, even without these special grounds for distrust, when eleven years so eventful in our Church, eleven years which have wrought such changes in the opinions of so many among our brethren, have elapst since Dr Hampden's condemnation,—seeing moreover that he

himself during that period has not let his pen lie dry, but has exprest his views again and again on several of the main points of Christian doctrine,—common fairness requires, that, before we renew the condemnation of what he preacht in the year 1832, we should take some account of the writings on the same or cognate subjects which he has publisht since. Or, when everything else has changed, are we determined that our passions, our animosities, our bitterness, our jealousies, our suspicions shall remain unchanged and unchangeable? Can we allow no appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, even after eleven years?

These various reasons led me to say that I must pause to examine into the matter, before I could take any step condemnatory of Dr Hampden's appointment. In deploring that appointment, I entirely concurred with you, adding that you could not deplore it, you could not condemn it, more than I did, as a most injudicious measure on the part of the Minister by whom he was appointed,—as a wanton outrage to the feelings, prejudices they might be, but still strong and earnest feelings, of a large body of the Church, especially of the Clergy,—as an act which would infallibly arouse vehement opposition, and break up the peace of the Church, at a time when we were hoping for something like a lull, after the storms of the late years, and which, in the present state of morbid excitement, might even be pleaded by many as an excuse for running into the Romish Schism. On these grounds I would have implored the Minister, on my knees, if it could have been of any avail, to recall what seemed to me an act of folly almost amounting to madness, of which I have never been able to learn the slightest explanation or defense. Greatly too should I have rejoiced to hear that Dr Hampden had declined an office, whereby it was plain that he must give such offense to so many of his brethren, coming among

them as an object of general suspicion and aversion, instead of being regarded, as a bishop ought to be, with confidence and love. By so doing he would best have consulted his own honour, and would probably have turned the current of opinion in his favour. But, however strongly I regretted and condemned the appointment on these grounds, these are not grounds to warrant a public protest against him. They might warrant a private remonstrance on the part of those who have the means of making one; but a public protest could only proceed on the plea that he has been guilty of heresy. This guilt however I could not assume, unless on the verdict of a competent tribunal, without a careful searching and sifting of his writings.

Even as a private clergyman, I should not hold myself justified in doing so; for even a private clergyman cannot divest himself of his individual responsibility in such an act. If a private clergyman urges that he has not the leisure, or the theological learning, requisite for such enquiries; *Be it so*, I would answer; *but then your course is plain and straightforward: you have pronounced yourself disqualified for taking part in this controversy; and you may be thankful that you have so valid a reason for refraining from it.* O that our clergy did indeed feel the awful weight of this obligation! How would it narrow the range of our theological disputes! how much more easily and speedily might they be settled! at all events, how little in comparison would the peace of the Church be disturbed! if we all scrupulously abstained from engaging in them, unless we had carefully and conscientiously taken pains to fit ourselves with the knowledge requisite for understanding their various bearings. Even as a private clergyman, I say, I should have held it incumbent on me to ascertain Dr Hampden's demerits, before I

proceeded to condemn him ; and I should not have said so much on this point, which might have been deemed, and ought to be self-evident, unless I had known of such a multitude of persons acting in utter disregard of the rule just laid down. But of course, in my position, where I was not only to express my own individual opinion, but to call on a large body of my brethren to adopt it, and take a deliberate public act in conformity to it, I should have deserved that the condemnation of Dr Hampden should recoil on my own head, if I had acted hastily and inconsiderately.

It is true, a Paper was laid on the table at the meeting of Convocation, and distributed to several of the members, which profest to give a series of propositions out of Dr Hampden's writings; and we were called upon in the Lower House to make some kind of remonstrance against his appointment to the episcopate, on the strength of these extracts. Of them I shall have to speak anon. But you, I believe, concurred with me in thinking that it was unbecoming the dignity of Convocation, and that it would only have shewn our unfitness for the functions of a deliberative assembly, if we had come to any resolution founded on mere rumour of what had taken place at Oxford, or on such a series of extracts set before us by an individual member of our body. You coincided with me, I believe, in holding that the only course which it would have behoved us to take, if we had been permitted to act, would have been to appoint a Committee specially charged to examine into Dr Hampden's writings, and to report to us thereon. Knowing, as every one must who is at all acquainted with the history of any literary, above all, of theological controversies, how easy it is for an ardent advocate to wrest the words of his opponent into meaning something very different from, and almost

opposite to, what their writer intended them to mean,—nay, knowing how very difficult, how almost impossible it is for a person, under a strong religious bias, not grievously to misrepresent his adversary, — knowing this from general history, and, as I have had more than one painful occasion of knowing it, from my own personal experience of the shifts and tricks to which the very best men will have recourse in such warfare,—I could not attach much importance to the series of extracts placed in our hands. For might we not constrain the Bible itself to inculcate atheism, by taking four words out of the first verse of the fifty-third Psalm, and command us to sin, by separating the first three words from the last two in our Lord's injunction to the woman taken in adultery? Alas! this is scarcely an exaggeration of what may often be seen in theological polemics.

In order to enter upon the investigation which was thus imposed upon me, I desired my bookseller to send me Dr Hampden's theological publications; but some accidental delays prevented my receiving them till ten days after our conversation on the subject; and thus I have been compelled to defer informing you of the conclusion I have been led to. Had that conclusion prompted me to act as you appeared to wish, my act would have been the most appropriate answer. But, inasmuch as I have been brought to a totally opposite result, I feel a kind of obligation to tell you why I cannot concur in the proceeding which you recommended; and since that result is in like manner repugnant to the spirit by which so many of our brethren are agitated, with very little, and often, I am afraid, with no cognisance of any reasonable ground for their agitation, it seems to me advisable to send you my answer in this public form. Nay, a necessity seems to be laid upon me to do what I can, if I can do anything, to dispell these

clouds of gloomy suspicion and restless irritation, which are darkening our Church. Most fortunate too do I count it, that, in so doing, I have the privilege of addressing a person for whom I entertain, as all who know you must, such sincere esteem and regard. For thus, I trust, I may be enabled, under God's help, to repress those intemperances of feeling and expression, into which controversy so readily lapses.

Now one of the impressions which have been produced on me by Dr Hampden's Bampton Lectures, is thankfulness for having become acquainted with a work so learned and thoughtful, and so favorably distinguisht both in these respects, and by its philosophical candour and sobriety, from the bulk of our recent theological literature. I do not mean that I agree with him on all points. Our minds have been trained in very different schools; and so our judgements often differ on questions of philosophy and taste, and even of theology. This however is not the matter before us. Heretics, you may remind me, have not seldom been learned and thoughtful. On the other hand the utmost diversity of opinion in the region of philosophy or taste supplies no ground for a charge of heresy; and there may be wide theological divergences without overleaping the bounds of orthodoxy. The question however which concerns us at present is, Has not Dr Hampden promulgated opinions which do overleap those bounds, and which are at variance with the Creeds and Articles of our Church? In a word, is there no heresy in Dr Hampden's writings? To such a question it is not easy to reply with an absolute negative. It would be a long and laborious task to hunt out every inkling of a heresy through every clause of every sentence, in a long, learned, and argumentative volume. For most persons it would be a wholesomer occupation to hunt out the heresies that lurk

within their own breast, and to exterminate them: and several of Dr Hampden's most pertinacious adversaries would be far more profitably employed, if, instead of trying to pull out, or rather, to thrust in the motes in his eye, they were to set about casting the beams out of their own eyes. The business of the counsel for the defendant is not to shew that his client has never been guilty of any offense, but to rebut those with which he is charged: and this, as to the main part of the charges which have come under my notice on the present occasion, will not be difficult: they will fall before us like a row of card soldiers. But before I enter upon them, let me premise a couple of remarks, which will shew how easy it was for many of his expressions to be misunderstood and misrepresented, while they will also shew how unfit the main part of his condemners are for passing sentence upon him.

A very small portion, I believe, of these condemners has any correct notion of the nature and purport of the work which they are so eager to condemn. It is a historical, more than a dogmatical work, a work of historical and philosophical criticism applied to an important period in the development of Christian Theology, professing in its title to consider the Scholastic Philosophy in its relation to Christian Theology, that is, to point out how that Philosophy, which exercised such power in the Church for several centuries, modified the development of our Theology, how it led to the construction of systems, in which at one time one doctrine, at another time another doctrine, was wrought out with great subtilty into all its logical consequences, and how the traces of this Philosophy, even after it has so long been exploded, are still discernible in our symbolical books, especially in their terminology. To this latter point he often turns, taking a particular interest, as men of philosophical habits of thought are wont to do, in tracing the

coinage of obsolete systems in the language of after generations. As to every reflecting mind it is pleasant to recognise relics of the Astrology of the middle ages in such words as *jovial*, *mercurial*, *saturnine*, so Dr Hampden will often stop to point out how still in our theological language we use the words of the Schoolmen, even when the notions implied in those words have long been abandoned. As he says, in the Introduction to the Second Edition of his Lectures (p. xxiii.), his discussions "have to do, not with any explanations of the Christian verities or doctrines, as such,—as they exist,—as they are revealed,—but with the language and forms of expression in which they are conveyed in theological systems."

Further, Dr Hampden is led by his subject to consider the effects which the love of system-making has produced on Theology; and he has a strong conviction of the evils it has wrought: nor can an intelligent student of the history of Theology well arrive at any other conclusion. The same conviction has been exprest strongly and repeatedly, in two of the most precious works of our age, *the Aids to Reflexion*, and *the Kingdom of Christ*. Coleridge has shewn how the love of system-making has given rise to inextricable controversies concerning Free-will and Necessity, Predestination and Election, in which spiritual realities are denied, because logical consequences have been drawn from them which contradict one another: and Dr Hampden enters into a like discussion, and also shews how consequences deduced from the abstract notion of Unity lie at the bottom of all the Anti-Trinitarian heresies, from Arius down to Priestley. In fact, this is one side of the great truth whereby Bacon regenerated Physical Science, and corresponds in great measure with the work which Socrates and Plato wrought in Greek Philosophy.

It may be that Dr Hampden, according to the wont of

all men, philosophers as well as others, may sometimes exaggerate the importance of his favorite proposition, and may push it too far. Still he is no way insensible to the utility and the necessity of sound logic, to counteract the mischiefs of unsound. Thus, he says, in his Introduction (p. lxv.), that Athanasius "admits that Scripture intimations of the truth would be better, as being more accurate; but that the versatility of the Arian party had obliged the bishops assembled at Nice to set forth more plainly such expressions as subverted the heretical impiety. In the same way I hold that the technical language of Theology has been both useful and necessary for maintaining the truth; whilst I point out its human origin, and connexion with the reasonings of ancient philosophy. Indeed I have said, and still think, that there is an advantage in the use of this technical language over the actual words of Scripture, for stating points of doctrine: since we can modify it as we please, and limit it accurately to the meaning we wish to express."

In consequence of his strong sense of the evils produced by logic in its uncontrolled exercise on theological questions, we often find Dr Hampden urging that the only sure ground to stand on is the Facts declared in Scripture. This expression is liable to misconstruction, and, I believe, is one of the chief causes of the suspicion he has incurred. For if by *facts* he had meant the mere outward occurrences narrated in the Bible, his theology might readily have coincided with the baldest Unitarianism. In preaching to a common congregation indeed, it would have been very injudicious to use such a term in any other than its ordinary sense. But, as he was preaching to the University of Oxford, he thought he might assume, that, notwithstanding their adherence to the

philosophy of Aristotle, they would understand the Baconian use of the word, which the context in several passages plainly sets forth; as, where he says (p. 150), that the discussions he had been engaged in "evidence the reality of those sacred *Facts* of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity." From this and many other passages, it is clear that he used the word as he interprets it in his Introduction (p. xl.). "To persons who have thoroughly entered into the spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, it would be unnecessary to explain what I mean by this term. Such persons would know that this term is not to be restricted to mere events or occurrences, or what may be called historical or singular facts, but denotes WHATEVER IS, Universal as well as Particular Truths, whether founded on Experience, or on the authority of Divine Revelation, and that it is opposed to Theory or Hypothesis. Thus the Divinity of our Lord is a Fact: His Consubstantiality with the Father and the Holy Spirit, His Atonement, His Mediation, His distinct Personality, His perpetual presence with His Church, His future Advent to judge the world, the Communion of Saints, the Corruption of our Nature, the Efficacy of Divine Grace, the Acceptableness of Works wrought through Faith, the Necessity of Repentance,—though stated in abstract terms,—are all Facts in God's spiritual kingdom, revealed to us through Christ. So I might proceed to enumerate, one after the other, all the Christian verities. But these instances may shew that it is not merely such Truths as our Lord's Birth, and Crucifixion, and Resurrection, and Ascension, and the Miracles which He wrought, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost, or the Call of Abraham, and the Thunders of Sinai, and the Dedication of the Temple, that come under the appellation of Facts, in the philosophical sense of that

term.—Nothing was further from my thoughts than to say that Christianity is made up wholly of mere Events, and has no Doctrinal Truths in it." In the next paragraphs Dr Hampden proceeds to vindicate his use of the word *Fact;* and in a note to his Inaugural Lecture he supports it by a quotation from Butler's *Analogy*. Of course I cannot enter into a discussion on this and the other points which I shall have to bring forward. To do so would swell out this Letter into a thick volume. My purpose is merely to shew what Dr Hampden really meant, and that his meaning, however it has been misinterpreted, is not heretical.

Here, in order to meet the charges against him, it becomes desirable to know what they really are. This knowledge, I believe, one might vainly seek from nine-tenths of the persons so forward in condemning him, who seem to think that the best way of proving their orthodoxy is to rush blindfold to hunt down a heretic. Thus one man calls him a Socinian, another an Arian, a third a Sabellian,—accusations which, like the monsters in a drop of water, destroy one another, and which the foregoing extracts, I trust, go far to disprove. To come to something more definite, let us take the Paper which was put into our hands at the meeting of Convocation. It is the only distinct embodiment of the charges against him which has fallen under my notice on this occasion; and, as it has been revived, after lying dormant for more than eleven years, one is led to suppose that it must possess a more than ordinary vitality. Of what kind that vitality is, we shall see soon. For vitality is not always a proof of inherent worth. The poet has told us: "Ah, sir, the good die first; And they, whose hearts are dry as summer dust, Burn to the socket."

That Paper consists of three parts. The first is the reprint

of a Declaration made by Resident Members of the Convocation of Oxford, in March, 1836. This is followed by a statement of certain reasons for its republication. And then comes a series of Propositions purporting to be taken from Dr Hampden's works, to establish the charges of heresy. On each of these parts I shall have to speak in succession.

The Declaration sets forth certain strong objections to the appointment of Dr Hampden as Professor of Divinity. I have no wish to meddle with the controversies of that period; but he who has republisht and circulated it now, and who distributed it the other day among the members of Convocation, in order to excite them to some kind of remonstrance against Dr Hampden's appointment to the episcopate, has thereby made himself responsible for its veracity. Now in this Declaration, after some general terms of condemnation, it is said: "We cannot allow any explanations of insulated passages or particular words to be valid in excuse against the positive language, the systematic reasonings, and the depreciating tone, with which, in Dr Hampden's works, the Articles of our Church are described as mere human speculations, the relics of a false and exploded philosophy, full at once of error and mischief." Here one can hardly help smiling, when one calls to mind how strangely the theological weathercock has veered round at Oxford, since the opponents of Dr Hampden were so zealous in asserting the honour of the Thirty-nine Articles. Many who pointed due East then, even, it may be, the very writer of this Declaration, have long been pointing due West. But, passing over this, we may easily be convinced, by an examination of Dr Hampden's writings, that the assertions here made against him are untrue. He does not describe the Articles of our Church, "in a depreciating tone, as mere human speculations, the relics of a false and

exploded philosophy." Human speculations of course they are, so far as they are merely deduced from Scripture by the processes of human reasoning; nor have I heard of any one who has claimed a higher origin for them, even at Oxford. Though they may have been called the Palladium of our Church, no legend of their having fallen down from heaven has come to my ears. But it is not the Articles of our Church, that Dr Hampden describes as the relics of a false and exploded philosophy: those terms are only applied by him to certain parts of the technical language in which they are exprest. In the Introduction already referred to, which naturally gives a more explicit account of the author's views on the points urged against him, and which, though it was not publisht till after the original Declaration, ought to have been examined by a person taking upon himself to revive it, Dr Hampden says: "As for explaining away language, that we have solemnly adopted, and still retain, I consider such a proceeding as dishonest. And, so far from condemning [these statements of Christian truths], I conceive the adoption of them by the Church as fully defensible. I believe that the leaders of the Church did well, and could do no otherwise, at the time when they sanctioned the introduction of our present Theological Language; acting to the best of their judgement for the Church, in its capacity of keeper of Holy Writ and Judge of Controversy. I would even go so far as to say, that, whilst theological terms are essentially mutable, and therefore ought to be altered, should circumstances require it, yet, what the ancient rhetorician observes of them is true, as a general rule; *illa mutari vetat Religio; et consecratis utendum est.*" Should any simple reader be startled by this assertion, that "theological terms are essentially mutable," in its application to the Creeds of the Church, I would

beg him to call to mind how greatly the three Catholic Creeds differ, not indeed in doctrine, but in their mode of stating their doctrine, and how, in the middle of her second millennary, it became necessary for the Church, wherever she desired to return to primitive purity of doctrine, to draw up new and more explicit Confessions of Faith.

To the same effect, in the latter part of his eighth Lecture, where Dr Hampden speaks expressly on this subject, he says: "Dogmas of theology then, *as such*, are human authorities. But do I mean to say by this that they are unimportant in religion?—I wish rather to establish their importance and proper truth, as distinct from the honour and verity of the simple Divine word. We have seen how doctrines gradually assume their form by the successive impressions of controversy. The Facts of Scripture remain the same through all ages,—not so the theories raised upon them. They have floated on the stream of speculation. One heresiarch after another has proposed his modification.—In such a state of things it was impossible for the Scriptural theologian—to refrain from mingling in the conflict of argument. Orthodoxy was forced to speak the Divine Truth *in the terms of heretical speculation;* if it were only to guard against the novelties which the heretic had introduced. It was the necessity of the case that compelled the orthodox, as themselves freely admit, to employ a phraseology by which, as experience proves, the naked Truth of God has been overborne and obscured. Such being the origin of a Dogmatic Theology, it follows that its proper truth consists in its being a collection of negations;—of negations, I mean, of all ideas imported into religion, beyond the express sanction of Revelation. Supposing that there had been no theories proposed on the truths of Christianity; were the Bible, or rather the Divine Facts which it reveals, at once ushered

into our notice without our knowing that various wild notions, both concerning God and human nature, had been raised upon the sacred truths, no one, I conceive, would wish to see those Facts reduced to the precision and number of Articles, any more than he now thinks of reducing any other history to such a form. We should rather resist any such attempt as futile, if not as profane; or, however judiciously such a selection might be made, we should undoubtedly prefer the living records of the Divine agency, to the dry and uninteresting abstracts of human compilers and expositors. But, when theoretic views are known to have been held and propagated, when the world has been familiarized to the language of these speculations, and the truth of God is liable to corruption from them, then it is that forms of exclusion become necessary, and theory must be retorted by theory. This very occasion however of the introduction of theory into religion suggests the limitation of it. It must be strictly confined to the exclusion and rejection of all extraneous notions from the subjects of the sacred volumes. Theory, thus regulated, constitutes a true and valuable philosophy, not of Christianity, properly so called, but of human Christianity, of Christianity in the world, as it has been acted on by the force of the human intellect. This is the view which I take, not only of our Articles at large, but, in particular, of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.—If it be admitted that *the notions on which their several expressions are founded are both unphilosophical and unscriptural*, it must be remembered that they do not impress those notions on the faith of the Christian, as matters of affirmative belief; they only use the *terms of ancient theories of philosophy*, theories current in the schools at the time they were written, to exclude others more obviously injurious to the simplicity of the faith. The speculative language of these

Creeds—was admitted into the Church of England, as establisht by the Reformers, before the period when the genius of Bacon exposed the emptiness of the system, which the Schools had palmed upon the world as the only instrument for the discovery of all truth.—The minds of men would be fully pre-occupied with the notions of *matter*, and *form*, and *substance*, and *accident:* and when such notions had produced misconception of the sacred truth, it would be a necessary expedient to correct that misconception by a less exceptionable employment of them." Dr Hampden then goes on to give the reasons why he thinks that *the occasion for Articles will probably never cease* (pp. 375—380). In this passage there is some questionable matter, especially about the real value of Dogmatical Theology; but no one acquainted with the history of Theology will controvert the statement here given of the origin of the definitions contained in our Creeds and Articles, though its application to the Nicene Creed is very narrow; and the whole passage shews that it is the terminology of those documents that the author speaks of as the relics of a false and exploded philosophy.

In the next paragraph but one of the Declaration it is said: "We now solemnly protest against principles which impugn and injure the Word of God as a revealed Rule of Faith and Practice, in its sense and use, its power and perfection." Verily this does bespeak no ordinary effrontery, to bring forward an accusation of this kind against a divine, the object of whose writings is to assert the exclusive honour of the Scriptures, as the sole infallible depository of Divine Truth. This is implied in the whole passage I have just quoted, and runs through the entire work. Thus, when speaking, in the Introduction, of what he calls the universal Facts of Christianity, the author says (p. xliii): "Let there be but the evidence that God has spoken it; and

the thing said is as real as if it had been the object of our experience. Christ's Intercession with the Father, for example, though it is going on at this moment, and will go on until the consummation of all things, is a certain Fact; we see not its beginning, or its end, or its process. But God's Word has declared that it is so; and this is enough. We may call it therefore, in the strictest sense, a revealed Fact. Again, that God worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure, or that we have no power of ourselves to do any good thing without His preventing and co-operating Grace, this is a revealed fact, a truth of God's invisible kingdom, ever in course of accomplishment, ever being realized. That our Lord is both Perfect God and Perfect Man, in one Person, or, as it is technically exprest, the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union, is in like manner a fact of the Gospel." Here we see moreover that, though the author elsewhere says, that the terms, *preventing and co-operating Grace*, and *the Hypostatic Union*, are derived from the notions of an exploded philosophy, he no way purposes thereby to question or disparage the truths involved in them.

Besides, in his *Inaugural Lecture* (p. 15), where he speaks of "the authorities and the course of religious study to which his whole theological instruction will have reference," he says: "Let me then at once state, that I purpose leading my hearers to the Scriptures themselves, as the sole supreme Authority of all revealed Truth. When I see in the Bible itself, how exclusively it reserves to itself the right of declaring the truth of God,—when I find it asserting its own sufficiency and certainty in making us wise unto salvation,—when I observe our Lord Himself citing the Scriptures of the Old Testament as decisive authorities, His Apostles also appealing to them, the primitive converts commended for their zeal in searching

the Scriptures, our Lord again characterizing them as testifying of Him, St Paul approving Timothy for having known the Scriptures from a child,—looking to these facts, and to the practice also of the early Church, in all its controversies, of deciding by the testimony of the written word, I cannot admit any other authority, as approaching at all to the weight and sanctity of the Evidence of Scripture. I should feel myself untrue to the great principle of Protestantism, which broke the seals of the Bible, and opened wide its pages to the reading of every Christian man; I should feel myself also untrue to the teaching of the Church of England, which so strongly declares that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation;—if, I say, with these strong assertions of the paramount authority of the Bible, I should receive any other authority as a legitimate source of Divine truth, I should convict myself of deserting the cause of Protestantism, and of our own Church, no less than the cause of the Bible itself. I shall be imperatively called upon by my duty therefore, in this chair of Theology, to lead the student to be diligent in prayer, and in reading of the Holy Scripture, and especially to employ his mind in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same. It will be my pride to train him to be mighty in the Scriptures, so that he may at his command draw forth by God's blessing 'the waters out of these living wells.'—At all times it becomes us to entertain a holy jealousy of encroachment on the supremacy of Scripture; so apt is human reason, under some form or other, to lift itself up to a usurped importance, and to derogate from the exclusive sanctity of the Divine Word. We ought therefore to watch with anxious care, above all things, that precious deposit of the oracles of God, especially committed to our veneration and care.—It is only in subordination, in humble and devout

subordination, to the Divine Word itself, that the Church has received its sacred commission. The word only which the Scripture puts into its mouth, can the Church utter as the word of Divine Revelation. To the Law and to the Testimony is its appeal. To the caviler and objector its only answer is, It is written." Now this Lecture was delivered just a week after the date of the Declaration. It was publisht immediately, and circulated rapidly, so that it soon reacht a fourth edition. Yet the Declaration, which charges Dr Hampden with principles impugning and injuring the word of God as a revealed rule of faith and practice, does not appear to have been modified, but doubtless received many signatures of persons who went and voted in Convocation against him on this ground. And now, after eleven years, during which, so far at least as we can form any judgement from his subsequent writings, he has been discharging his office according to the rules he had here laid down for himself, this accusation, which from the first was utterly groundless, which was in direct contradiction to the whole spirit of his Bampton Lectures, is brought forward again, without a word of explanation, or limitation, or even an additional argument in support of it. Clamour on the part of the accusers, Ignorance on that of their hearers,—in which it is to be hoped that the accusers themselves have no small share,—these are the powers relied on to bar his way to the Episcopate, the two uncouth, unwieldy giants that throw their clubs across his path.

In the second part of the Paper which I am examining, there is little to detain us. After speaking, in temperate terms, of the reasons for reviving the attack on Dr Hampden, the writer says: "For this purpose some of the passages in Dr Hampden's works, on which his disqualification rests, are here reprinted from the Report of the

Committee appointed to select them. It is not denied that extracts alone will not always afford a just estimate of a whole work; but the necessity of resorting to them is unavoidable; nor is there any reason to suppose that those now given are otherwise than fairly quoted; while by affixing to them their respective references, the opportunity is afforded to the reader to judge for himself by referring to the works in question. The point to be borne in mind is, that the opinions professed in these passages have never been recalled, nor the positions maintained in them abandoned." In these sentences there are two points that I will just notice.

First, the writer says, that "there is no reason to suppose the extracts given are otherwise than fairly quoted." So reckless is party-spirit in these days, that a person will bring forward the gravest accusations against a divine, who has filled, and has been selected to fill, such high offices in the Church, before a solemn assembly, and will call on that assembly to act upon them, without taking the trouble to examine whether the passages which he adduces as the grounds of them are correct; and this too, after it was notorious that the accuracy of the quotations made by Dr Hampden's adversaries in 1836 had been denied, and after their inaccuracy had been exposed by Mr Hull, in a pamphlet written with his unvarying conscientious love of truth. The writer does indeed say, that the references will enable his readers to verify the extracts: but how many of his readers did he expect to take this trouble, when he himself did not? Nay, how many would even have the means of doing so? Is it become a valid excuse for uttering a falsehood, according to our modern casuistry, that the hearer, by due enquiry, may disprove it?

In the next place, when it is said that Dr Hampden has

never recalled his opinions, it should at least have been added, that he has disclaimed the opinions imputed to him. He could not recant opinions, which, in the Introduction to the second edition of his Lectures, he denied having ever held. Even Papal infallibility is esteemed by the sober members of the Romish Church, to extend merely to doctrine, not to fact. When it condemns a doctrine, it cannot err. But on the question whether the doctrine condemned is held by such or such a man, it is liable to human fallibility. And after the slovenly manner in which the accusation against Dr Hampden had been conducted, there was little reason for him to suppose that his adversaries understood his meaning better than he did himself. The very calmness and mildness of his vindication is a strong presumption in its favour, especially when we consider the provocations he had received; and though it has been asserted that the Introduction is inconsistent with the Lectures, no intelligent and candid person, I think, can read it, without a conviction that the whole line of thought is precisely the same; though of course it brings out particular points, the points which had been misunderstood, and which required explanation, more prominently and explicitly.

Moreover, in his *Inaugural Lecture*, after declaring his belief in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, he adds (p. 8): "To this sublime confession I have solemnly and devoutly been pledged in infancy by the fostering care of the Church; and to the same in the mature age of reflexion I have as solemnly and devoutly set my hand; and I reverentially appeal to the Searcher of hearts, as a witness, that I have never for one moment swerved from this true faith of the Gospel, but that the more I have enquired into Scripture, —the more conversant I have become with theological antiquity,—the more I have laboured to know of the doctrine

whether it be of God, by improving in doing the will of God,—the more I have been convinced that the Trinitarian doctrine profest by our Church is the true one, that it cannot be denied without expunging the Scriptures themselves, and unlearning every lesson which inspired Prophets and Evangelists and Preachers have taught us. In what I have ever written, or said, or thought, on theological subjects, I have constantly had this deep conviction of the sacred Truth present to my mind. Whether I have been engaged in speculative discussion, or in practical teaching, I have had in view to bring it home to the understanding, so far as such a mystery could be brought home to the understanding, free from glosses and misconstructions, and to the heart in all its winning persuasiveness to holiness and divine consolation. I will not pretend always to have stated my conviction in the fullest, clearest manner, so as to have avoided all possibility of misinterpretation. I will not claim to have been invariably accurate in the use of words, or to have anticipated every possible objection that could be raised against particular modes of statement. Nor again can I presume that I have always made my practical aim so distinct and so direct to the heart, as invariably to have hit the object in view.—Especially too where a recondite track of observation is pursued, where the meaning of controversial statements is to be disentangled, and the thread of obsolete speculations and reasonings to be recovered, there will in all probability be an opening for misunderstanding on the part of others, on whom the light of his researches falls but dimly amidst the surrounding shadows. Still, if there is a real desire on the part of the teacher to inculcate the truth, there must be a natural interpretation of my words consistent with such desire, and distinct from the perverse sense which has been drawn from them. If then I am candidly judged

by this my real intention, it will be found that in nothing have I departed from the true Catholic faith of the Trinity, but that, on the contrary, I have made it my ground-plan of theological instruction throughout, the fundamental true assumption on which my argument proceeds in every theological discussion. And now, as Theological Professor, can I have any other object proposed to me, but to guard this sacred deposit with all fidelity and diligence? May God forbid that anything I may say or do in the discharge of this trust, should have any other effect, but to strengthen and extend the knowledge of the Revelation of God through Jesus Christ, the mystery of the Trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, one God blessed for evermore." This is not strictly a recantation indeed; because Dr Hampden was not conscious of having anything to recant. But the best, and only really valuable recantation is the confession of the truth. When St Paul preacht the faith, which aforetime he had laboured to destroy, there was no need of any further recantation in words. Even if Dr Hampden had been led fifteen years ago by his speculative tendencies into certain erroneous refinements concerning the nicer points of doctrine, this should hardly be visited upon him as a grave offense now, provided all his more recent writings have been orthodox. But he says, "The truths, which you conceive me to have impugned, I hold, and have ever held, with all my heart and mind. I have endeavoured to make them the principles and groundwork of all my teaching. In following them out in a curious historical and theological enquiry, I may sometimes have exprest myself inaccurately, often obscurely, and thus have afforded room for misinterpretations. These however are questions which can only be brought to an issue by a learned and precise discussion.

If I have said anything contrary to these truths, it was equally contrary to the purpose of my soul. The truths themselves I held then, I hold now, and, so help me God, will hold to my life's end." What kind of recantation do his enemies want, if they will not be satisfied with this? Do they want him to stand in a white sheet, or to kneel before them and kiss their toes? And what example have they set him in this matter? Has one of the falsehoods which have been uttered against him, been retracted? Have they not been repeated again and again? and are they not called up now as bitter and as fierce as ever?

But it is time to enter into a more specific examination of these charges. That I may do so as thoroughly as I can, I will here insert the whole series of Propositions, which form the third part of the Paper laid before us, numbering them for the facility of reference. They are entitled "Propositions maintained in Dr Hampden's Work."

1. *Dialectical Science* . . . established that peculiar phraseology which we now use, in speaking of the Sacred Trinity as *Three Persons* and *One God*.—p. 130.

2. The whole discussion [on the Blessed Trinity] was fundamentally dialectical.—p. 104.

3. No one can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject of the Holy Trinity, on which our technical language is based.—p. 150.

4. Revelation teaches us only, that God has manifested Himself *relatively to us*, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.—Sup.

5. Unitarians, in that they acknowledge the great fundamental facts of the Bible, do not really differ *in religion* from other Christians.—Observ. pp. 20, 21.

6. There is much of the language of Platonism in the speculation on the Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit.—p. 117.

7. The orthodox language, declaring the Son "*begotten* before all worlds

of one substance (sic) with the Father," was settled by a philosophy, wherein the principles of different sciences were confounded.—p. 137.

8. The divine part of Christianity is its facts: the received statements of doctrines are only episodic additions, some out of infinite theories which may be raised on the texts of Scripture.—p. 390.

9. The application of the term punishment to the *sacrifice* of our Saviour belongs to the Aristotelic philosophy.—p. 250.

10. The bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, that it depressed the power of *man* too low.—p. 253.

11. Christ is emphatically *said* to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that *we may know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him* (sic).—Ib.

12. "Atonement," in its true practical sense, expresses the fact, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of Atonement made, not that God may forgive us, but that we may forgive ourselves.—p. 252.

13. Our Saviour's mode of speaking, that *virtue* had gone out of Him, is characteristic of *the prevalent idea*, concerning the operation of Divine Influence, as of something passing from one body to another.—p. 315.

14. Our Saviour, in accompanying His miracles with significant actions, *condescended* to the prejudices of His followers, who believed that His word or His touch acted after the manner of secret agents in nature.—pp. 314, 315.

15. The imperfection of the writers [of Scripture] may accidentally infuse alloy into the character of the truths concerning God.—Observ. p. 15. (First Edit.)

16. We are not to take *the words or propositions written by the inspired writers* as the *substance* of the revelation, instead of looking to the *authenticated dealings of God in the world*.—Observ. p. 14. (First Edit.)

17. A reception of the Scripture, not simply as the living word of God, but as *containing* the sacred *propositions* of inspired wisdom, is an improperly directed veneration.—B. L. p. 91.

18. A participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the *operation* of *Grace* according to the Schoolmen, and is a pantheistic notion.—Comp. Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. 2 Pet. i. 4.—B. L. p. 197.

19. The notions on which the several expressions of the Articles at large, and in particular of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural, belong to ancient theories of

philosophy, and are only less obviously injurious to the simplicity of the Faith than those which they exclude.—p. 378.

20. The speculative language of these Creeds was admitted into the Church of England, as established by the Reformers, before the genius of Bacon exposed the *emptiness* of the system, which the Schools had palmed upon the world, as the only instrument for the discovery of all truth.—Ib.

21. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds involve scholastic speculations.—p. 544.

22. All *opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature.* It is only a *fallacy*, to invest dissent* in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant.—Obs. p. 5.

23. The Orthodox ought to have contented themselves with the *name* of Original Sin, to designate the moral *fact* of the *tendency* (sic) to sin, in human nature.—p. 224.

24. The Pelagians asserted that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation,* but by *example:* though their language inadequately expresses the inveteracy of the sinfulness of human nature, *their grounds were right*, so far as they attempted to give a *moral* account of the fact; and *their opponents were wrong*, so far as they attempted to give a *physical* or *material* account of it.—pp. 222, 223.

25. A positive deterioration of our carnal nature is a Scholastic notion. —p. 225.

26. The idea, that the corruption of nature exists in infants, is the result of Theory.—p. 221.

27. The notion that Faith is a source of the knowledge of God, is derived from an eclectic philosophy, in which the mysticism of Plato was blended with the analytic method of Aristotle.—p. 80.

28. The conception produced in the mind by speaking of grace *operating* and *co-operating*, grace *preventing* and *following*, is very erroneous. —p. 187.

29. To regard Grace as something "infused" into the soul, by virtue of which the sinner is justified, and the operation of which on the heart is to be traced through the stages of its process, is part of the Scholastic system.—pp. 188, 189.

30. The doctrine of the Sacraments is based upon the mystical philosophy of secret agents in nature, Christianized.—pp. 314, 315.

---

* "Dissent," in Dr Hampden's language, includes Unitarianism.

31. The ready reception of the theory that Christ, as the sole primary cause of grace, conveyed that grace through the Sacraments, as subordinate instrumental causes by which the Divine agency accomplished *its* ends, is sufficiently accounted for by the general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church.—Ib.

32. The notion that the Sacraments are visible channels, through which virtue is conveyed from Christ Himself to His mystical body, the Church, is part of the theoretic view of the Scholastic Philosophy.—p. 311.

33. The assertion of a real and true presence of Christ in the Eucharist resulted from the original *Platonism* of the Church.—p. 72.

34. The inquiries in our Baptismal Service, "With what *matter* was this child baptized?" "With *what words*," &c. "Because some things," it is said, "*essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted," are derived from the subtle speculations about *matter* and *form*, introduced to establish and perfect the theory of *instrumental efficiency* ascribed to the rites themselves.—p. 336.

35. The use of the expressions, being made a "member of the body of Christ," or being "incorporated" ("engrafted into the Church," Art. XXVII.) as equivalent, is owing to the *confusion of ideas* prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism.—pp. 324, 325.

36. The decision as to the intrinsic *efficacy* of the rite of Baptism can be only speculation.—p. 344.

37. The popular belief in the separate existence of the soul is a remnant of Scholasticism.—B. L. p. 310.

38. Observ. pp. 21, 22. "In truth, I say, it ought not to exist. Theological opinion, as necessarily mixed up with speculative knowledge, ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian Society, or a mark of discrimination between Christian and Christian. Wherever speculative truth is involved there must be presupposed an opening for improvement; whereas articles of religious communion, from their reference to the fixed objects of our faith, assume an immoveable character, fatally adverse to all theological improvement." See Observations, pp. 10, 18, 28, and Postscript to Observations, p. 10.

39. Observ. pp. 23, 24. "Are the doctrines [of the Church] *as expressed in our formularies* . . . precisely those which the primitive Church declared? . . . Granting, for the sake of argument, that the dogmas of the Church are precisely what they were in the earliest age of Christianity; or that such a coincidence, if it existed, would be a test of a perfect theology (which I do not admit); it is evident, at any rate, on examination,

that a great deal of the false philosophy of former times is involved in the expressions which convey them."

40. Observ. p. 20. "When I look at the reception by the Unitarians both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of Divine facts the name of Christians."

41. Observ. pp. 20, 21. "Putting him, however, on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which I should place any other Christian, I propose to him impartially to weigh with himself, whether it is not *theological dogmatism* and not *religious belief*, properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent."

42. B. L. vii. p. 315. "The general belief in Magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence (viz. the theory of inward grace working by outward signs). The maxim of Augustin, *Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum*, appears to be in fact an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms, to the subject of Religion. . . ."

This array seems formidable enough; but appearances, we know, are often deceptive, and never are they more so than when they are conjured up by the *Odium Theologicum*. Of these Propositions the first seven are placed together, as bearing more or less on the doctrine of the Trinity. Yet, with regard to some of them, one is at a loss to understand why they were cited; for they merely state facts, which every one acquainted with the history of Theology knows to be true. Did the citer,—for, though they were publisht by a Committee, the selection of them was probably assigned to one of its members; else at all events I may be excused, if I would rather impute the guilt of them to a single individual, than to many;—did the citer, I say, alledge them in honest ignorance? If so, he proved his incompetence for the work he undertook. Or did he know that they were innocent, and wish to impose on and frighten his readers, who might be alarmed at seeing

strange and obscure words and phrases connected with the primary truths of religion, and would perhaps fancy that the seeds of all heresy and infidelity lurkt in the notion that Philosophy can have anything to do with Theology? much as a simple man, with a glass of water at his mouth, might be terrified if he were told that he was drinking a combination of oxygen and hydrogen. Yet few persons have objected more strongly to such a union than Dr Hampden. He merely speaks of the historical fact, that it has often been attempted, though never, he thinks, without evil results. What, for instance, is there, except the statement of a historical fact, in the words "*Dialectical science* establisht that peculiar phraseology, which we now use in speaking of the sacred Trinity as *Three Persons and One God?*" Was the reader meant to infer that Dr Hampden had said, that the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity originated merely in *dialectical science?* He speaks only of the phraseology used in expressing that doctrine. "The disputation (he says, p. 130, speaking of the controversies in the fourth century), in its progress, turned upon the point, how far difference might be asserted, consistently with that sameness which constituted the Divine Unity of Being or Substance. It was enquired whether the distinction could be rightly exprest by *Hypostasis*, or *Persona;* whether the ideas involved in one, or the other of these terms did not import too express and real, or too shadowy a distinction. The difficulty here was, to avoid distinguishing the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in such a way as to represent them differing, as three angels, or three men differ from each other, and yet to preserve the real distinctions. Dialectical science furnisht the expedients in this difficulty, and establisht that peculiar phraseology which we now use in speaking of the sacred Trinity, as three Persons and One God." So much for our first heretical proposition.

The second is just akin to it. "The whole discussion on the blessed Trinity was fundamentally dialectical." Here again the only answer required is to adduce the passage out of which these words have been wrested. "What rendered these disputes more complex, was, that they were agitated whilst as yet an active intercourse subsisted between the Greek and Latin Churches, as members of one spiritual body. The Latins were unable—to reach the precision and compass of the Greek phraseology. But the Greeks, regarding their own tongue as the sacred idiom of philosophy and theology, strove to impose their own modes of thought, and their very words, on the reluctant sense of the Latins. Even among the Greeks themselves, disputes were multiplied, as each employed the principal terms of the controversy in a strictly philosophical, or in a popular acceptation; as the habits of thought in individuals were coloured with Oriental or Greek associations. So great indeed were the impediments arising from the varied use of Terms, where *the whole discussion was fundamentally dialectical,* that the measure of accommodation between those who really agreed with each other, would probably have failed in any other hands but those of Athanasius.—He seized the points of agreement between the contending parties, and by his wise and conciliatory policy secured at least a standard of orthodoxy for future ages of disputation, both to the East and the West (pp. 103. 104)." Who could have imagined that a heretical meaning could have been extorted from this passage, or that the words printed in italics would have been severed from the context as a ground for such a charge?

The third Proposition is still more dishonest. Dr Hampden closes his third Lecture by saying (p. 150): "I should hope the discussions, in which we have now been engaged, will leave this impression on the mind. Historically

regarded, they evidence the reality of those sacred facts of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. But let us not identify this reality with the theories coucht under a logical phraseology. I firmly and devoutly believe that Word, which has declared the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But who can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject, on which our technical language is based? Looking to the simple truth of Scripture, I would say, in the language of Augustin, *Haec scio. Distinguere autem inter illam Generationem et hanc Processionem nescio, non valeo, non sufficio.—Verius enim cogitatur Deus, quam dicitur; et verius est, quam cogitatur.*" From this passage Dr Hampden's accuser extracts the words, "No one can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject of the Holy Trinity on which our technical language is based." Thus he produces the impression of a mere negativeness, leaving out the declaration of faith which precedes, and the passage of Augustin which fully bears out the negation, and to which the accuser himself would not have dared to attach an odious meaning.

The fourth extract I have not been able to find; nor do I understand the reference. I have only the second edition of the Bampton Lectures, which, I am informed, is an exact reprint of the first, with the addition of the Introduction already spoken of. But it seems clear that Dr Hampden's meaning cannot be correctly represented by the words, "Revelation teaches us only that God has manifested Himself *relatively to us* as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." He is too exact a thinker to be guilty of such confusion; and he expressly speaks (in p. 131) of the terms, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as "denoting *intrinsic relations* in the Divine Being."

The sixth Proposition,—"There is much of the

language of Platonism in the speculation on the Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit,"—is falsified by the generalizing of words, which Dr Hampden applies solely to the speculation of Aquinas on the subject. After giving an account of that philosopher's explanation, he adds, "In *this* speculation there is certainly a great deal of the language of Platonism;" and he goes on to prove this. It would be well if those who are so sharpsighted in detecting aberrations from doctrinal truth in another, would be watchful to preserve themselves from far more sinful offenses against moral truth.

The seventh Proposition is taken from the following passage of the Bampton Lectures (p. 137). "The discussions on the Incarnation were in like manner partly physical, partly logical. It was attempted to be explained in what way the Son might be said to be generated of the Father, whether out of the Substance of God, or out of a common Divinity, of which each participates, or by division of the Paternal Substance, as a portion severed from the Father; whether further He is the Son of God by nature, or necessity, or will, or predestination, or adoption. The confusion of principles of different sciences in these promiscuous enquiries is sufficiently apparent. But it was by such a philosophy that the orthodox language was settled, declaring the Son 'begotten before all worlds,' of *one Substance* with the Father." The meaning of this last sentence is plain. According to the author's wont, of tracing the remains of obsolete systems in the current language of theology, he here remarks, innocently enough, that the expression, *of one substance*, has been handed down to us out of the ancient controversies concerning the relation between the Son and the Father. What then can be the heretical meaning, which his accuser designs to impute to him, by citing the proposition, "The orthodox language,

declaring the Son '*begotten* before all worlds, of *one substance* (sic) with the Father,' was settled by a philosophy, wherein the principles of different sciences were confounded?" At least the only thing reprehensible in these words is what the accuser himself foists into them, by printing *begotten* in italics; as though Dr Hampden had asserted that this also was a term derived from a confused philosophical system. One is loth to impute fraud to any one; but our accuser has shewn little claim to a charitable interpretation, either from his own ordinary practice, or from his mode of dealing with his victim.

The fifth Proposition,—"Unitarians, in that they acknowledge the great fundamental facts of the Bible, do not really differ *in religion* from other Christians,"—I have reserved for this place, because it is not connected with the ancient controversies on the Trinity, and because it is extracted from another work, Dr Hampden's *Observations on Religious Dissent;* which was publisht at the time when the question about the admission of Dissenters was much agitated at our Universities. On this question, as also on the more general ones, as to the sinfulness of Dissent, and as to the greater or less comprehensiveness which ought to characterize a Church, various opinions may exist; and each person will of course hold that those who differ from him are mistaken. But it does not follow from this, that those who differ from us are to be branded as heretics, or to have any moral obliquity imputed to them. Dr Hampden's opinions on these points are what are commonly called latitudinarian. But latitudinarianism also may be of divers kinds. One kind, which is utterly worthless, may result from an indifference about religious truth. Another kind may arise from a Christian, Apostolical largeness of spirit, which recognises that all minor differences are of very subordinate, if of any importance,

provided there be agreement upon the central principles of truth. In the interval between these two extremes there is room for many shades of opinion. Now the proposition just cited is not stated distinctly in so many words by Dr Hampden. It is a deduction from the following passage. "In religion, properly so called, few Christians, if any, I speak of course of pious minds, really differ. All acknowledge with nearly unanimous assent, I believe, the great original facts of the Bible. They may not be conscious perhaps, that they do so far agree; and the reason of this is clear; namely, that they judge of their religion from their theological opinions, and reflect back on the one, simple, invariable truth of God, the various lights of some speculative system of doctrines, the mere conclusions of their own reason." Thus far, I conceive, all men of intelligent and candid minds, would agree with Dr Hampden; and the same thing has been said by such persons over and over again. But he then proceeds to argue that the same dogmatical spirit is a principal element and cause of Unitarianism. "I would take the extreme case of the Unitarians; and I would say to them, 'Why do you take so much pains to convince the world that you do not agree with the mass of professing Christians, in believing in the same sense, "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all." Is it not that you identify your religion with your dogmas; that you transfer the natural partiality of your own minds for certain principles, to the broad outlines of Scripture truth, and dissent from your brethren in the faith, because they will not assent to your metaphysical conclusions? For when I look at the reception by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of Divine facts, the name of Christians. Who

indeed is justified in denying the title to any one who professes to love Christ in sincerity?—I do not forget, that passages of Scripture have been retrencht or explained away by Unitarians. But is not this very proceeding an illustration of the mode of interpreting religion by speculative dogmas and conclusions? Not only is the religious fact, but the books themselves, which are the vehicle of it, made to bend and take a colouring from theological opinion. I allude to the case of the Unitarian more particularly, because in the ordinary view he is regarded as more liberal, as less exclusive in his creed, than members of other Christian communions. And I wish it to be considered, whether he is not on the other hand as dogmatic as any other religionist; perhaps the most so of all, so far as he insists, beyond all others, on applying a positive sense to passages and expressions, which Revelation leaves in the darkness of the clouds surrounding the Divine presence. Putting him however on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which I should place any other Christian, I propose to him impartially to weigh with himself, whether it is not theological dogmatism, and not religious belief, properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent (pp. 19, 20)." In this passage, as in several others treating on the same subject, along with much important truth, there seems to me to be an admixture of error, arising partly from our almost irrepressible propensity to push our favorite conclusions too far, and partly from a somewhat indistinct apprehension of the very truth the author is proclaiming, namely, that the ground and centre of all Christian union is, not agreement in a system of doctrines, but the Person of the Incarnate Son of God, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind; as the early Church recognised by making the Apostles Creed the

universal Confession of Faith; and as has been so admirably shewn of late in *the Kingdom of Christ.* But, at all events, how different is the impression produced by this passage, taken as a whole, from that of the Proposition which the accuser deduces from it, without mention of the strong objections urged against the dogmatical spirit of Unitarianism!

From this Pamphlet seven other extracts are taken, on which I need not spend many words. Indeed two of them (40, 41,) are fragments of the passage just cited, which acquire a more offensive aspect by being severed from the context. In two others, (38, 39,) if they are lookt at with attention, and with a recollection of what has been said, the offensiveness will vanish; even without a reference to the context, which would still more completely disperse it. Another Proposition (22), said to be drawn from these *Observations*, is as follows: "*All opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature.* It is only a *fallacy* to invest dissent in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant." To aggravate the odium of this passage, a note is subjoined, stating that "'Dissent' in Dr Hampden's language includes Unitarianism;" though it is only some pages after, that he speaks of Unitarianism as an extreme case; and it is not very candid to apply a remark, made generally concerning a class of things, to an extreme case. But the extractor's, or rather detractor's, candour will be more manifest, when we see a correct version of his Proposition, and of the context: "For if all opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature, it is only a fallacy to invest dissent in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant. The awe of the sacred objects indeed imposes a fearful responsibility on every one in forming his own opinions; but it is no reason that others should depart from those principles by which they would judge him in

other subjects. They may guard against his supposed errors with more caution and accuracy on account of their importance; but they must not wield against him the terrors of the invisible world (pp. 5, 6)." What would be the doom of a witness before a court of justice, who gave such garbled evidence? In old times he would have run a risk of the pillory.

The same spirit is indicated in the two remaining extracts from the *Observations*. Dr Hampden publisht a second edition of them in the same year, 1834, in which he corrected certain passages, where he thought his expressions liable to misconstruction. Of this fact the extractor must have been aware, as in two instances (15, 16,) he cites the first edition of the *Observations*. And why does he cite it? Because it contains expressions, by which he thought he might add fuel to the odium against Dr Hampden, though Dr Hampden himself had corrected and withdrawn them. Moreover, such is the disregard for truth with which such matters are now carried on, the author of the Paper laid before us in the Convocation tells us to bear in mind that Dr Hampden has never recalled his opinions, or abandoned his positions. Yet, even in the first edition, if viewed in connexion with the whole context, those passages, fairly interpreted, become innocent. "The real state of the case (Dr Hampden says,) in regard to our Scriptures is, that the whole Revelation contained in them, so far as it is revelation, consists of matter of fact. Either we have direct and continuous history, acquainting us with the Being, providences, and mercies of God, as the occasions of the world have presented them to our view; or we have predictions of his conduct, as it would appear on certain future occasions; or, as is the case in the didactic and devotional portions, reflexions on the Divine agency in the world, and

application of the instances of His Providences, whether already disclosed, or foretold in prophecy, to the awakening of our love and gratitude and adoration. I venture to say, there are no propositions concerning God in Scripture, detacht from some event of Divine Providence, to which they refer, and on which they are founded. Some perhaps will say, 'An inspired writer has said thus or thus: this then, as asserted by him, is matter of fact: and accordingly it is on matter of fact, in this sense of the expression, that the Christian Revelation is said to be founded.' The expression, *matter of fact*, will no doubt admit this sense. But to interpret the Scripture Revelation in this manner is only to return to the assertion of its dogmatic character, under another form. It brings us back to take the words or propositions written by the inspired writers, as the substance of the Revelation, instead of looking to the authenticated dealings of God in the world. When I say therefore, that the Christian Revelation is matter of fact, I intend by it to express my conviction that the substance of the Revelation is the doings and actions of God: I have always before my view some event in the history of God's providences, to which I refer it. In this sense the truth concerning God is independent of any peculiar wording of it: its proper divine character is exempted from all alloy which the imperfection of the writer, the peculiarity of his circumstances, the idiom of language, may accidentally infuse into it. In this sense texts *as texts* prove nothing: texts establish Divine truths, only as indices to real facts in the history of Divine Providence." Now this paragraph, even as it is thus exprest in the first edition of Dr Hampden's Pamphlet, contains a fund of important truth, so far as it urges that essential characteristic of the Scriptures, whereby they differ so greatly, both from the religious books of other religions, and from all the theological systems

founded upon them, that they are not a dogmatical treatise, that they do not set forth the truths which they reveal under the form of abstract propositions, but in their living power, as they are gradually manifested more and more distinctly in the unfolding of God's dealings with mankind; even as the physical world does not utter the law of Gravitation in so many words, and yet does utter it in myriads of ways, by millions of signs and tokens. Nor is it a denial of the law of Gravitation, to say that the physical world does not declare it in the form of a distinct proposition; and in like manner it is no denial of the Scriptural truths, to say that they also are not declared in that form. The general confusion in this respect is the foremost among the innocent causes of the misrepresentations to which Dr Hampden has been subjected. He strongly felt the importance of the truth just explained: he felt no less strongly how the neglect of it has occasioned a number of grievous errours in all ages of the Church, errours as rampant now as ever, especially in the lower classes of Dissent. He felt that, when this truth is lost sight of, and the practice of building up systems of propositions on single words or texts of Scripture is indulged in, all manner of heresies and forms of dissent are sure to spring up. This is the substance of his argument in the passage last cited, and the reason why it is there brought forward. Of course in a Pamphlet, written no doubt hastily, he could not enter fully into this argument, or set it forth with its appropriate limitations: and as some expressions in the latter part of that passage seemed to admit of misconstruction, he left out all but the first two sentences in the second edition. Yet his accuser, being determined to make him an offender for a word, even when that word had been recalled, scrapes up two Propositions (15, 16) out of the sentences which the author had rejected. One is, "We are not to take *the*

words or propositions written by the inspired writers as the *substance* of the revelation, instead of looking to the *authenticated dealings of God in the world:*" which cannot possibly be rightly understood without reference to what had gone before. The other is, "The imperfection of the writers [of Scripture] may accidentally infuse alloy into the character of the truths concerning God." Here the emphasis is greatly magnified by the conversion of an incidental observation into a distinct proposition; while the words, *the imperfection of the writer*, may reasonably be understood to mean that which arose from his position in the gradual unfolding of Revelation; whence the earlier writers had a less full insight into the glory which was to be revealed, than they who lived with and after Him, who was the Incarnate Truth of God, and brought "life and immortality to light."

It may be rejoined indeed,—for there is nothing from which the unrelenting hostility of some of Dr Hampden's enemies will shrink,—that, as in his letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1838 he said, "I recant nothing that I have written; I disclaim nothing," he may lawfully be charged with whatever can be wrung out even from expressions which he has thrown aside. But of course that declaration merely means, that he is not conscious of having in any respect deviated from the great doctrines of Christianity as set forth by our Church, that, having always held those doctrines with an entire belief, and having endeavoured to make them the principle and rule of his teaching, he is not aware of having ever impugned them, and that the charges brought against him have not convinced him of his having done so. It does not mean, that he had never exprest himself inaccurately or imperfectly in the course of his various disquisitions: for that he had done so, he had amply admitted in his *Inaugural Lecture:*

and a special acknowledgement of this is involved in the omission of the questionable sentences, which his accuser has thought fit to pick up and pelt at him.

To return to the Extracts from the Bampton Lectures: the next Proposition fabricated out of them, the eighth in the whole series, is pieced together of scraps of sundry sentences in the last page but one of the last Lecture. "I would once more call attention (Dr Hampden says) to the Divine part of Christianity, as entirely distinct from its episodic additions.—Whatever may have been the speculations of false philosophy on the facts of Christianity, those facts themselves are not toucht.—These facts form part of the great history of mankind: they account for the present condition of things in the world: and we cannot deny them without involving ourselves in universal scepticism. There can be no rational doubt that man is in a degraded, disadvantageous condition, that Jesus Christ came into the world in the mercy of God to produce a restoration of man, that He brought Life and Immortality to light by His coming, that He died on the Cross for our sins, and rose again for our justification, that the Holy Ghost came by His promise to abide with His Church, miraculously assisting the Apostles in the first institution of it, and ever since that period interceding with the hearts of believers. These and other truths connected with them are not collected merely from texts or sentences of Scripture: they are parts of its records. Infinite theories may be raised upon them; but these theories, whether true or false, leave the facts where they were." Out of this passage this Proposition is concocted, meant to convict the author of heresy: "The Divine part of Christianity is its facts: the received statements of doctrines are only episodic additions, some out of infinite theories, which may be raised on the texts of Scripture." This is evidently

intended to convey the impression that Dr Hampden regarded the received statements of truth as merely some out of infinite theories which might be raised out of the words of the Bible, and, the reader would of course suppose, as not materially differing in value from the rest: whereas his words, in the sense in which he used them, are simply true and harmless.

The next four Propositions relate to the theory of the Atonement, a subject on which every one at all conversant with the history of Theology knows that a number of theories have been constructed. Of these Propositions, the first (9) may be past over, as merely stating a historical fact, that the application of the word *punishment* to the sacrifice of our Saviour is taken from the Aristotelian philosophy; that is to say, as a theoretical term, involving a speculative explanation of the work of Redemption, though supported by analogous expressions in Scripture. Dr Hampden further says: "It is to be remarkt how strongly the inefficacy of repentance to wipe away guilt, and restore the sinner to his lost state, has imprest the minds of those who have thought on human nature with any depth of philosophy. It is of little purpose to urge the natural placability of the Divine Being, His mercy, His willingness to receive the penitent. God, no doubt, is abundantly placable, merciful, and forgiving. Still the fact remains. The offender is guilty: his crime may be forgiven; but his criminality is upon him. The remorse which he feels, the wounds of his conscience, are no fallacious things. He is sensible of them, even whilst the Gospel tells him, 'Thy sins be forgiven thee. Go, and sin no more.' The heart seeks for reparation and satisfaction: its longings are, that its sins may be no more remembered, that the characters in which it is written may be blotted out. Hence the congeniality to its feelings of the notion of Atonement. It

is no speculative thought, which suggests the theory: speculation rather prompts to the rejection of it: speculation furnishes abstract reasons from the Divine attributes for discarding it as a chimera of our fears. But the fact is, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of Atonement made. The word Atonement, in its true practical sense, expresses this indisputable fact. Objections may hold against the explanations of the term: they are irrelevant to the thing itself denoted by the term. Turn over the records of human crime; and whether under the forms of superstition, or the enactments of civil government, the fact itself constantly emerges to the view: all concur in shewing that, whilst God is gracious and merciful, repenting Him of the evil, the human heart is inexorable against itself. It may hope, tremblingly hope, that God may forgive it, but it cannot forgive itself. This material and invincible difficulty of the case, the Scripture Revelation has met with a parallel fact. It has said, we have no hope in ourselves, that, looking to ourselves, we cannot expect happiness, and at the same time has fixt our attention on a Holy One who did no sin, whose perfect righteousness it has connected with our unrighteousness, and whose strength it has brought to the evil of our weakness. Thus Christ is emphatically said to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that we *may know* that we have past from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our *own hearts* may not condemn us. 'If our heart condemn us not,' then may we 'have peace with God:' but, without the thought of Christ, the heart that has any real sense of its condition must sink under its own condemnation."—(Pp. 251—253.)

Who would have imagined that, out of this excellent

passage, two heretical Propositions would be extorted? The first (12) is: "'Atonement' in its true practical sense expresses the fact, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of atonement made, not that God may forgive us, but that we may forgive ourselves." Just observe how this sentence is patcht up, and how shamefully it misrepresents the author. Standing thus alone, it is intended to signify that Dr Hampden represents the word *Atonement* as, "in its true practical sense," merely expressing the subjective fact of our consciousness of the need of an Atonement. Whereas, after speaking of this subjective fact, he shews how Revelation has provided the objective fact corresponding to it. And is not this correspondence and harmony between the wants of our nature and the gifts of Revelation one of the strongest evidences of its truth, a proof that it is the true key, from its fitting all the wards of the mysterious lock? The last words in the Proposition are torn out of another sentence, where they stand in a different connexion and meaning: "The heart may hope, tremblingly hope, that God may forgive it; but it cannot forgive itself."

The other Proposition (11) is: "Christ is emphatically *said* to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that we *may know* that we have past from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by Him." What is the objectionable matter in these words, it is not easy to see; except that the citer, by printing *said* in italics, seems to insinuate that Dr Hampden meant to question the truth of Christ's really being our Atonement? Yet nothing of the kind is involved in the use of so common a phrase. I have seen it objected indeed somewhere, that it is heretical to deny a change of purpose in God; and that this is inconsistent with our second Article, where Christ is said to have died "to

reconcile His Father to us." But it is plain that these words must be interpreted in conformity to the passages of St Paul from whence they are derived; and it is to be regretted that the framers of our Articles did not more closely follow St Paul's expression, and say, 'to reconcile us to the Father.' For thus St Paul writes: "And all things are of God, Who hath *reconciled us to Himself* by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ *reconciling the world to Himself*, not imputing their trespasses to them, and hath committed to us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you, in Christ's stead, *Be ye reconciled to God*." (2 Cor. v. 18—20.) So again (Rom. v. 10), "For if when we were enemies *we were reconciled to God* by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." Again (Eph. ii. 16), "That *He might reconcile both to God*, in one body by the Cross." In like manner (Col. i. 20, 21), "For it pleased the Father, that in Him should all fulness dwell, and, having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to *reconcile all things to Himself;* by Him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven: and you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, *yet now hath He reconciled* in the body of His flesh through death." I know not however whether Dr Hampden meant more by what he has said, than that the reason why Christ is called our Atonement, is not that we may be led thereby to speculate concerning the nature of God, and to ascribe changeableness to Him, but that we may have a full assurance that by his death we are reconciled to God. This explanation is more in accordance with the general spirit of his theology.

The remaining Proposition on this subject (10) is: "The

bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, that it deprest the power of *man* too low." Now what do these words mean? Standing as they do among a series of Propositions concerning the Atonement, and immediately after one which speaks of the Sacrifice of Christ, the reader is of course intended to infer that "this baneful philosophy of expiation," which thus "deprest the power of man too low," must have related to that Sacrifice. A more perfidious citation was never made: and I understand, as may readily be supposed, that this is the passage which, of all others, has kindled the greatest indignation against its author. Now these words do indeed follow in the original just after the long passage I have quoted about the Atonement. But that passage had been preceded by a discussion on the philosophical speculations concerning punishment, as a compensation for sin, in which the author speaks of the vain notion that "self-mortification would recommend us to the favour of God," and again, "of the fond impiety of supererogation." Returning to this point, he adds: "The bane of this philosophy of expiation was, not that it exalted human agency too highly, but that in reality it deprest the power of man too low. It was no invigoration of the mind, no cheering of the heart to masculine exertion, in working out the great work of salvation, by exaggerated, yet noble, views of what man could accomplish. But it checkt the aspirings, both of the heart and of the intellect, by fixing them at a standard that had only the mockery of Divine strength, and not the reality. It brought men to acquiesce in a confession of impotence, without carrying them at once to the Throne of Grace. The ecclesiastical power stood between the heart and Heaven. Atonement was converted into a theory of Commutation, degrading to the holiness of God, while it spoke the peace of God in terms of flattering delusion to

the sinner. The value of confessions and rites of penance was acknowledged; and, accepting this vain substitute for that assurance of Atonement, which alone can satisfy the longing soul with goodness, men lookt no further. Their proper power was exchanged for a servile dependence on the ministrations of the Priest, the presumed all-sufficiency of a man like themselves" (p. 253).

The next two Propositions, along with several others, are taken from a discussion in which the author tries to shew how the theological theories of the middle ages were modified by the Realism and the materialist notions of their philosophy. This is a field for ample argument, in which one may differ widely from Dr Hampden. But though his views of that philosophy may be deemed narrow, and not very profound, this can hardly be accounted a disqualification for the Episcopate; since one may fairly doubt whether ten men have sat on the Bench during the last hundred years, who were much profounder philosophers. In examining these Propositions, we must bear in mind that Dr Hampden's expressions mostly refer, not to the Scriptural truths, but to the Scholastic theories concerning them. Thus the Proposition (30), that "The doctrine of the Sacraments is based upon the mystical philosophy of secret agents in nature, christianized," is merely applied (in p. 314) to the Scholastic, not to the Scriptural doctrine. In like manner the remarks about the connexion between the general belief in magic, and the belief in the magical power of the Sacraments (31), manifestly refer only to the medieval notions concerning them, not to the true doctrine, that Christ operates spiritually through them. Again, where it is said (13), that, in the instance of the woman with the issue of blood, our Lord is described as having perceived that "*virtue* had gone out of Him, — a mode of speaking characteristic of

the prevalent idea concerning the operation of Divine influence, as of something passing from one body to another," —this remark means no more than that the writers of the New Testament used the language of their time with regard to physical facts, without being commissioned to correct that language by the revelation of a sounder natural philosophy. From a like love for etymological speculations, Dr Hampden remarks, in a Note on page 324: "We should observe the confusion of ideas prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism. The Church was considered as the *Body of Christ*. The Church also was *the Mother of the Faithful*. Hence being baptized, and being made *a Member of the Body of Christ*, and being *incorporated* into the Church, became equivalent expressions. Hence too the Church was said to *generate* sons by baptism." Again, in a Note to page 336, where the author had been speaking of the use of Scholastic terms with reference to the Sacraments, he says: "Hence the enquiries in our baptismal service: 'With what *matter* was this child baptized? With *what words* was this child baptized?'—'because some things, it is said, *essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted through haste.'" Now the first of these Notes plainly means merely to point out the confusion of metaphorical terms; the latter, that, even in those simple questions, the words *matter* and *essential* are derived from the Scholastic philosophy. These remarks may not be worth much, and so are only placed in a foot-note. But it is strange to find them adduced as evidence of heresies (34, 35).

Another Proposition (33) on the same subject is: "The assertion of a real and true presence of Christ in the Eucharist resulted from the original *Platonism* of the Church." Here the words "and true" are stuck in by the citer, evidently with the purpose of making Dr Hampden's

statement contradict our doctrine. His words however are: "The questionings of the eleventh century on the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist evince a doubt as to the point where the evidence of the senses ends, or how far such evidence might be admitted against internal convictions of the mind. Here the original Platonism of the Church ruled the case. A Real Presence was asserted, which implied the deceptiveness of the senses" (P. 72). That is to say, the doctrine objected to, so far as any objection is conveyed in these words, is the Romish one of Transubstantiation, of which our Articles say, that "it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."

A somewhat similar perversion occurs, when the historical statement, that "the pantheistic notion of a participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the operation of Grace according to the Schoolmen" (p. 197), is turned into the abstract proposition (18), that "a participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the *operation* of *Grace* according to the Schoolmen, and is a pantheistic notion." This proposition is followed by a reference to 2 Peter i. 4, θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, of course to insinuate that it contradicts these words of the Apostle. Yet it requires no depth of logic to know, that what is merely stated as an accident of the subject, is not convertible into a predicate. There may be a pantheistic view of the participation of Deity; and the author has tried to shew in some detail that the view of the Schoolmen was such. Still this no way impugns St Peter's declaration, as having a pantheistic character. It is well known how those words of St Paul,—where he says that *in Him we live and move and have our being*,—have been

cited by Pantheists in support of their doctrine. But no one would charge a man who contended against Pantheism, with controverting the grand truth proclaimed by St Paul.

This logical juggling is a familiar practice with our accuser. We have seen several instances of it already. In like manner, Dr Hampden having said (p. 225), that "the idea that prevails throughout the Scholastic discussions on the subject is of a positive deterioration of the carnal nature," his adversary charges him with asserting the proposition (25), that "a positive deterioration of our carnal nature is a Scholastic notion." This coincides with Dr Hampden's statement, in the sense that it was a notion held by the Schoolmen; but then there is nothing heretical in it: whereas in the objectionable sense, which it is intended to bear, that the notion originated with the Schoolmen, it is not warranted by Dr Hampden's words; unless indeed we lay a strong emphasis on the word, *carnal*, as implying a physical, material deterioration of our nature.

So again Dr Hampden, in his account of the Scholastic doctrine of Original Sin, says: "The *universality* of the principle was to be demonstrated. How could it apply, it would be argued, to the case of the infant soul snatcht out of the actual pollutions of the world, as the tender lamb of His flock, taken up by the Shepherd into his own bosom? The theorist, not content with referring to the Redeemer's love, as the simple earnest of the blessedness of the little innocent, sought how to connect this fact with the universal need of Redemption. It was to be brought therefore under the theory of Original Sin. This occasioned the introduction of the term *propagation* into the account of the origin of evil. If the corruption of nature descended by *propagation*, then would it exist even in the guileless infant; and the theory, as thus

stated, would be the logical correspondent to the doctrine of Grace." Out of this statement of the Scholastic theory the accuser manufactures the Proposition (26): "The idea that the corruption of nature exists in infants is the result of theory."

Again, in his second Lecture, Dr Hampden, speaking of the Scholastic Theology, says (p. 80): "Its principles were to be drawn from the nature of the Divine Being, as the only sure ground on which a Divine and Universal Philosophy could fix its first steps. But where was the evidence or criterion of the truth of those principles? Given the nature of the Divine Being, given the principles themselves, immediately as they existed in Him, there could be no doubt of the truth of the conclusions deduced from them. But it was admitted that the nature of God, as He is in Himself, is incomprehensible by the human faculties, that we cannot attain in the present life to the knowledge of His essence. This difficulty might appear insuperable. But it was not so to the Schoolman, verst in an eclectic philosophy, in which the mysticism of Plato was blended with the analytical method of Aristotle. The principle of Faith here answered the purpose of solving this speculative difficulty, as well as of securing the prescriptive right of Authority. Theology then, as a natural knowledge, could not itself discover and establish the principles on which it reasoned. It might however receive those principles through Faith, from a higher science, the science or knowledge of God; as one human science receives its principles from another; as Music, according to the illustration of Aquinas, assumes its principles from Arithmetic, or Perspective from Geometry." To this passage a Note is subjoined, giving the words of Aquinas; and from this passage the detractor conjures up the following Proposition (27): "The notion that Faith is a science of the

knowledge of God is derived from an eclectic philosophy, in which the mysticism of Plato was blended with the analytic method of Aristotle." Thus, if one were to say that an Oxford High-Churchman had made use of the most shameless sophistical juggling for the sake of crushing an opponent, a logician of the accuser's school would convert the proposition into an assertion that sophistical juggling is an offspring of the University of Oxford; though the history of controversies shews that such poisonous weeds spring up too readily in all parts of the earth.

Happily I begin to see light, and shall soon be able to relieve both you and myself from this odious investigation, one scarcely less revolting than the worst of those which our Sanitary Commissions have to undertake. Two Propositions (28, 29) are quoted from the discussion about Grace in the fourth Lecture, where the author shews how our language, and our modes of thought, as influenced by our language, on that subject are still affected by the Realism of the Schoolmen; through which Realism expressions, primarily metaphorical, were conceived to denote distinct realities; and Grace, for instance, was regarded, not as the merciful act of a gracious God, but as something existing distinctly in the nature of God, separate from His other Attributes, and infused, as a distinct substance, by Him into the soul of man. Dr Hampden's views on this subject may be controverted, if any one chooses to controvert them, on philosophical grounds; but they have nothing more to do with his orthodoxy, than the question has, whether he believes in the Copernican or the Ptolemaïc System.

The only two remaining passages that seem to call for any notice, relate to the Pelagian controversies; concerning which Dr Hampden says (p. 222), that "Pelagius contended for a moral influence of prevarication of Adam on his posterity; that the first sin was hurtful to the human

race, not by *propagation*, but by *example;* not because they who were propagated from him *drew* from him any vice, any fault; but because all that have afterwards sinned have *imitated* him, the first sinner; and that infants were not in the same state as Adam before transgression, because he was capable of obeying a precept, whilst they had not as yet the exercise of free-will. Celestius, in like manner, rested the corruption of our nature on moral grounds, arguing that sin was not born in us, but was the fault of the Will.—Though the language of the Pelagians did not adequately express the inveteracy of that sinfulness of human nature, which Scripture and the world declare with one voice, we must allow, I think, that their grounds were right, so far as they attempted to give a moral account of the fact, and that their opponents were wrong, so far as they attempted to give a physical or material account of it." From this passage the following Proposition (24) is deduced: "The Pelagians asserted that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation*, but by *example:* though their language inadequately expresses the inveteracy of the sinfulness of human nature, *their grounds were right*, so far as they attempted to give a *moral* account of the fact; and *their opponents were wrong*, so far as they attempted to give a *physical* or *material* account of it." This extract is fairer than most of the others, though by its omissions it weakens the author's assertion of our sinfulness. But here again the point in dispute belongs more to the philosophical, than to the religious side of theology. The fact of our sinfulness Dr Hampden fully admits. What he objects to is the explanation of that fact, of the mode in which sin is transmitted; and in conformity to the principles of his philosophy, he rejects the physical and material explanations of the Realists, and prefers regarding our sinfulness as a primary, inexplicable

fact of our moral nature. He goes on to say, that "the Pelagian theory of human sinfulness sufficiently accounted for the *actual* sins of men. It shewed how our nature might be depraved or improved, that its actual depravation consisted in transgressions like those of the first parent; but it left unexplained the *tendency* to sin existing in human nature, a fact evidenced in the difficulty of resistance to temptation, in the self-denial which right conduct exacts,—'the law warring in the members,' as the Scripture calls it. The following evil example, the assimilating of ourselves to the first transgressor, is only one mode by which this evil tendency finds its way into our conduct, and betrays itself. In itself it is something beyond, and more intimate with our feelings. It had been well, if the orthodox had contented themselves with the name of Original Sin to designate this moral fact, and, whilst they disclaimed the Pelagian theory of Example or Imitation, as inadequate to the solution of the fact, themselves abstained from speculating concerning it. But disputation called upon them to define and pronounce. They thus essayed, what neither Scripture had authorized, nor human reason could reach, to explain the mode of human corruption, to analyse by language the *thing* denoted by the term Original Sin, when the only subject before them was a general fact requiring to be simply and clearly stated." The heretical Proposition (23) drawn from this passage is: "The Orthodox ought to have contented themselves with the *name* of Original Sin, to designate the moral *fact* of the *tendency* (sic) to sin, in human nature." I cannot see that this requires any further answer than is conveyed by the original passage.

Here at length we may pass out of this valley of death. There are still three or four Propositions that I have not noticed; but they seem to be merely stuck in to swell out

the list, and, after what has already been said, need no examination. Such a collection of fraudulent misrepresentations has hardly ever come under my notice, though I have had much sad experience in this way; and it has been a painful task to expose them. But, as I have had to say on a former occasion, a lying spirit is stalking through our Church, and even taking possession of some minds that would otherwise be among its pillars and noblest ornaments: and this spirit we must endeavour to cast out, at whatsoever cost. Who the collecter of this series of Propositions may be, I know not. Most probably he will be found among those whose love of truth has sought a congenial resting-place in the Romish Schism; and his natural end seems to be, unless some higher spirit arrest him, to become a familiar of the Inquisition.

Irksome too as it has been to go on untying one knot of falsehood after another, it seemed requisite that the work should be done thoroughly once for all. My reason for taking the series of charges in the Paper which was laid before us at the meeting of Convocation, I have already stated. It is the only definite, articulate accusation of Dr Hampden that has come in my way. If others have been publisht, they have not reacht me here in the country; nor have I heard of any, except some anonymous letters in newspapers, with which no prudent man will meddle, if he can help it. I am aware indeed, that several pamphlets, some of them by persons of eminent name, were publisht during the contest in 1836. But, as their authors have not brought them forward again, one is loth to rake them up out of the oblivion, which is the fittest sepulcre for such things: and since the republisher of the Propositions, if I have not been misinformed, took an active part in the first controversy, we may assume that a person well acquainted with its details would select the strongest

statement out of those which were then produced. Possibly I may in some instances have done some slight wrong to the original collecter of the Propositions; for, as I have before said, I have only had the second edition of the Bampton Lectures to compare them with. But I have been told, on what seemed to be the best authority, that there is no difference between that and the first. Should the fact be at all otherwise, the chief blame will be due to him who has reprinted the extracts from the first edition without comparing them with the second.

And now, my dear Dean, to what conclusions are we brought? What judgement must we form on Dr Hampden, so far at least as regards the heresies imputed to him, if this is the strongest evidence that can be adduced? Are we not constrained to pronounce the completest, most honorable acquittal? What judgement must we form on the character of his accusers? What weight must we attach to the censures of the Convocation of Oxford? It was doubtless on these very Propositions, which we have found to be such gross misrepresentations, or on others of the same kind, that the great bulk of the majority, which voted against him, rested their sentence. Even if the evidence had not been thus garbled and distorted, Dr Hampden's work is one on which nobody is fitted to pass judgement, unless he has been trained to philosophical habits of thought, can exercise speculative discrimination, and has some considerable acquaintance with the history of theology. Yet of how many among his self-constituted judges can we predicate that they possest these indispensable qualifications? Among those too who did possess the intellectual qualifications, how many would not have been challenged on any jury on account of some personal bias? Yet it is on the strength of a decision pronounced by such a tribunal, that the Church is called upon to utter

her remonstrances blindly and vociferously from all parts of the land. About three years ago, some of Dr Hampden's chief assailants were themselves loud in declaring that the Convocation of Oxford is ill qualified to judge on matters of heresy; for then, through the ebb and flow of party-spirit, the tide had turned against them. Yet now the same persons, and thousands taking up their cry, are exclaiming that the Church must put forth all her powers, even in unprecedented modes of action, to arrest the appointment of a Bishop whom the Convocation of Oxford has condemned. The inevitable result of such a struggle must be, that efforts,—which, if made wisely in a righteous cause, with the strength which springs from being in the right, and from a well-grounded conviction of being so, would awaken the sympathy of the whole nation, and be sure of success,—being exercised inconsiderately, and without that sole true strength, must needs fail, and will incur pity from some, contempt and ridicule from others.

In speaking of Dr Hampden's writings, I have confined myself to those which have been selected by his opponents as the grounds of their attacks. Now the latest of these was publisht more than twelve years ago. Surely then, even if there had been more occasion for censure in his early works, we ought to have examined his later ones, with a view of ascertaining whether any traces of the heresies imputed to the earlier are discernible therein: and in them we should find him repeatedly maintaining the very doctrines which he is accused of having denied. You would not have had us protest against Augustin's being made Bishop of Hippo, because in earlier days he had been tainted with Manicheism. Of Dr Hampden personally I know nothing, and ten days ago had never read a word of his writings. An aversion to controversies,

when I have no immediate call compelling me to engage in them, kept me from taking any interest in those which agitated Oxford in 1836; and opinions exprest by some of my friends had led me to imagine that the Bampton Lectures were far less valuable than I have found them to be. Hence I have had no personal motive for undertaking his defense; and, though there is always a satisfaction in attempting to obtain justice for one who has been wronged, this would not have induced me to come forward now, unless other stronger motives made me deem it my duty to do so.

These were, first, that I felt bound to explain, at least to the Clergy of my own Archdeaconry, why I have refused to comply with the invitations which have come to me from several quarters, to join in the proceedings which have been so generally adopted to avert Dr Hampden's appointment. Those over whom one is set to exercise influence, and in brotherly union with whom it is one's heart's desire to fulfill the great work of life, have a right to be informed why one cannot go along with them, nay, desires to repress them, when they are stirred by a strong impulse. But my chief motive has been to do what I can, if I can with God's blessing do anything, to allay the present tumultuous ferment in the Church. The only way of effecting this is to dissipate the delusions whereby it has been kindled. We are called to walk in the light, not in the darkness. We are to walk in the light in all things, in the daylight of the clearest knowledge to which we can attain. We have intellectual gifts entrusted to us; and we are not to let them rust: we are to exercise them diligently, patiently, perseveringly, on all occasions. We are not to take up opinions at random, prejudices at hap-hazard. Where we have not the means of knowing, we are to refrain from speaking. In this noisy, turbulent

world, we are especially called to cultivate the holy faculty of silence. When we have good reason for believing that we know the truth, then let us speak it, openly, upon the housetops, before kings. But when we have no such reason, let us leave the office of speaking to those who are better qualified.

Much zeal has been manifested on this occasion; and zeal in a righteous cause is ever to be honoured. "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing." But zeal without discretion, zeal under the impulses of ignorance, has dragged martyrs to the stake. Does it not prove to us that the same spirit would be no less violent now, were it not that the changes in outward circumstances and in public opinion bridled us in,—does it not constrain us to hang down our heads in shame,—when we hear of thousands, as it would seem, of our brethren rushing eagerly to protest, to remonstrate, to sign addresses, against Dr Hampden, while there is scarcely any evidence that a single one among these thousands has thought it his duty to make out carefully and conscientiously how he ought to act, and while it is too plain that hardly one of them has studied Dr Hampden's writings with the view of forming his decision? In what other class of men could such a thing happen? Would it happen among lawyers? among physicians? among soldiers or sailors? among merchants? *No!* it will probably be replied: *but then the matters they are concerned in are not of such deep, universal moment, and do not peril our eternal interests.* Yet surely this very consideration ought to make us more careful, more cautious, more scrupulous, ought to teach us that, though in other things we may allow ourselves to act on plausible presumptions, yet, in these matters of awful importance, it behoves us to use all our vigilance, to strain every eye of the mind, lest we deliver an unjust, and

therefore an ungodly judgement. Even the town-clerk of Ephesus would have taught us more orderly and decorous conduct, that we ought to be quiet, and do nothing rashly, but proceed regularly before a lawful court. Whereas our agitation, which is only the more tumultuous from the want of any reasonable grounds for it, has involved us in something like a November London fog, where there is no one, except the noisy linkboys of the religious newspapers, to shew us the way. Darkness is the element of fanaticism; and they who walk in darkness are sure to stumble. It is only in the light that we can walk straightforward, calmly and steadily; and so, and so alone, can "we have fellowship one with another."

May we, my dear Dean, endeavour so to walk in all things! and may it ever be our prayer to the Father, that He will cast His bright beams of light, and pour down the Spirit of right judgement, abundantly on ourselves and on the whole Church!

Yours very sincerely,

J. C. HARE.

Herstmonceux, December 11th, 1847.

Since this letter was written, I have read the Remonstrance addrest to Lord John Russell by thirteen of our Bishops, and his answer to them: and though the result has only verified the opinions I have been expressing, it has filled me with deep regret. It has been a great grief to me to see such a body of the Fathers of our Church, among whom are several persons held in honour by our whole Church, and for several of whom I have reason personally to feel high regard and respect, placed in a situation in which, it seems to me, they could not but fail of accomplishing their object. Their sacred office and character

would doubtless have ensured their success, if they could have adduced adequate reasons for their remonstrance: but the most painful part of the affair is, that the general sense of justice will go along with the Minister in his refusal to attend to it. For, though a private remonstrance, previous to the appointment, urging that it would be repugnant to the general feeling of the Clergy, and would tend grievously to disturb the peace of the Church, would, and ought to have had very great weight, yet, when the appointment had once been determined upon, and that determination had become so notorious, it would have been derogatory to the Crown to have retracted its nomination on any less ground than that its nominee had been pronounced guilty of heresy by the sentence of a regular ecclesiastical tribunal. Nor could the Crown accept the decree of the Convocation of Oxford in lieu of such a sentence; more especially when the Bishops themselves, as Lord John Russell reminds them, refrain from expressing any judgement on the point. The popular ferment might have been a reason for hesitating beforehand, but could not be so now, unless it were shewn to be reasonable. An unreasoning excitement is to be allayed, not by giving up its victim to it, but by calm consistency and cogent argument.

Besides, I feel bound here to retract the condemnation exprest in my letter on the conduct of the Minister in making the appointment. Still indeed I deplore that appointment, on account of the offense which it was sure to give to so many, and of the consequences which we, knowing the feelings of the Clergy, could foresee must inevitably ensue. But the Minister, who cannot possibly be in like manner acquainted with those feelings, and who had the presumption supplied by Dr Hampden's having discharged his professorial office for so many years without any complaint against his doctrine, took all the precautions

which became a person in his position, by communicating his intention so long before to our Primate. Having done this, it seems to me, he is bound to maintain his appointment, unless some judicial reasons for withdrawing it are placed before him. After this proof that the present agitation must be utterly ineffectual, that it can produce nothing but distraction, contention, and other evils, I trust it will soon abate. In trying to quiet it, I will most gladly join with you heart and hand. This strengthens my conviction of the necessity of proving to the Church, that the act of the Minister is not an arbitrary exercise of the power with which he is invested, that he is not tyrannically imposing a heretical Bishop on our Church, and that the person whom he has nominated does not deserve the charges brought against him, but may boldly plead, and has pleaded, that he is entirely innocent. Surely it is not too much to hope that many of our brethren, when they see this detailed, explicit refutation of the accusations against Dr Hampden, will at least be led to examine his works, and may perhaps be aided by the foregoing remarks in perceiving that the Extracts, on which they have grounded their opinions, have grossly wronged him; and when this point has been gained, the sense of justice must needs do the rest. Let Righteousness and Truth meet together, Mercy and Peace will ever come in their train.

December 14th, 1847.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE SECOND EDITION.

As I am called upon to publish a new edition of this Letter, it seems incumbent on me to take some notice of the remarks which it has elicited from various quarters. And here, if the position of the writer, as well as the priority in point of time, did not claim precedence for Lord John Russell's Letter to the Clergy of Bedford, his superiority in courtesy would. For that courtesy I am bound to render him my respectful thanks, more especially as, after the somewhat unmeasured condemnation with which I had spoken of his conduct, even though that condemnation was subsequently retracted, a sensitive or ungenerous man would have been deeply offended. But while I gratefully acknowledge his courtesy, I grieve to say that the reflexion and the experience of every succeeding day have only confirmed my original conviction, that the appointment of Dr Hampden to the Episcopate was a very unfortunate, nay, disastrous measure for our Church. The grounds of that conviction, I have already explained, are totally irrespective of his personal merits or demerits. They rest solely on the feelings with which, I was certain, that appointment would be regarded by a very large body, at least of our Clergy, on the violent repugnance, I felt assured, it would excite, on the agitation, the ferment, I knew, it would kindle. These prognostics have been most sadly

verified; and so how can I abandon the conviction which I formed when only looking forward to them? Evil as my forebodings were, the results have exceeded them. Alas too, we are very far from having seen the end of these calamities as yet: may God avert, or at least mitigate those which still seem to threaten us!

At the same time let me repeat my acknowledgement, that, as the Minister could not be in like manner familiar with the feelings of the Clergy, as he had the presumption afforded by Dr Hampden's unimpeacht discharge of his professorial duties for so many years, and as he had gone beyond the usual measure of precaution to ascertain the sentiments of the Church, by informing the Primate of his intention several months beforehand, the judgement which I formed on his conduct in the first instance, was mistaken and unjust. It was not indeed formed lightly. For the Meeting of Convocation afforded me an opportunity of hearing the opinions of its members from all parts of the Province; and all concurred in reprobating the appointment, and wondering what motive could have led to it. Nor had I fallen in with any one, of whatsoever party, whether in politics or in the Church, who took a different view of the measure, as a matter of expediency and practical wisdom. Moreover it was strongly rumoured, and has since been acknowledged by Lord John Russell himself, that the Primate had sent in a remonstrance of some sort against the appointment; and as this rumour seemed to proceed from persons cognisant of the fact, I could hardly do otherwise than infer that the Minister had acted in disregard of what I have understood to be the usual practice, of consulting with the chief ecclesiastical authority in our Church before a new bishop is nominated. It was under this persuasion that I exprest my strong condemnation of his conduct; and when I found that this persuasion was

erroneous, I was of course bound to retract it. Mr Trower indeed, in his Remarks on my Letter (p. 18), thinks my retractation a proof that I myself can veer round still more rapidly than the theological weathercock at Oxford. But I have yet to learn that any want of stability is implied by changing one's opinion with regard to a fact, on becoming acquainted with new circumstances, which materially alter the aspect of the case, or by forming one judgement, when I conceived that a resolution had been taken without the usual preliminary consultation, and another judgement, when informed that the usual measure of consultation had not been neglected, but exceeded. To those who, like the great body of Dr Hampden's opponents, take up their judgement without regard to facts, this may seem reprehensible inconsistency. For my part, I wish that I could see more of this kind of inconsistency even in Mr Trower himself.

Still, on the grounds above stated, I must continue to deplore the appointment, because it has so miserably broken the peace of the Church, as from the first I anticipated it would do. Lord John Russell indeed replies to this objection, that "there is no use in crying Peace, when there is no peace." Now these words, in their original, scriptural, spiritual sense, are profoundly, awfully true. It is a destructive delusion to cry Peace, to those whose souls are still at enmity with God. The rebellious will must be subdued, and brought into subjection to the will of God, before there can be any real peace in the soul; and they who would persuade us that we can find peace in any other way, deceive and betray us. But it is otherwise in the relations between man and man. Here perfect peace is unattainable in this world, even on the smallest scale of a single family, much more so in a nation or a Church. In the very best condition, the seeds of discord, of strife,

of enmity, will always be latent; and if we were not to recognise the existence of any peace, until these seeds are wholly extirpated, the gates of the temple of Janus would never be shut. Such however is well known to be very far from the traditional policy of the present ministers in civil affairs. They have never said, that there is no use in crying Peace with France, when there was no peace. They did not wish, a few years back, that M. Guizot should be turned out of office, and M. Thiers appointed minister in his stead, because there was no use in preserving peace, while so many elements of irritation were fermenting. Surely the very first duty of a Government is to controul and suppress these elements, to keep them in order and bind them down, primarily by wisdom, by a sound, discreet, mild, just policy, removing all grounds of offense, as far as may be, and then, should wisdom be found unavailing, by force. Nor has any statesman been more assiduous than Lord John Russell, in inculcating that this ought to be done in the first place by wisdom and prudent conciliation, in order to avert the necessity of using force. Hence it would surely have been most unwise in a Minister, if from his position he could reasonably have foreseen the consequences of Dr Hampden's appointment, to select a person whose very name had become a kind of watchword to awaken slumbering animosities. It is too true, that there are sad elements of discord in our Church: but also, through God's mercy, there are elements of peace. Imperfect and full of evil as her condition still is, there is a zeal, there is a devotedness to the duties of the pastoral office, there is a desire after holiness, nay, in spite of all our distractions and quarrels, there is a yearning after union and unity, far beyond anything that has been seen at least within the last two centuries. And they who love Jerusalem, should not only pray for her

peace, but should also do what they can to promote it, and should refrain most watchfully from whatever is likely to disturb it.

Moreover, let me remark, it is especially the office of a Bishop to be the centre of unity, the promoter of peace, and of union for all good works, in his Diocese. Hence it has always seemed to me among the most desirable qualifications for a Bishop, that he should not be notorious as a leading member of any of the strong parties in our Church. I do not mean that he ought to be a man belonging to what is termed the *juste milieu*, whose merit consists in a knot of negations, but that he should have that expansive power of Christian wisdom and love, which will enable him to embrace all the forms of true Christian zeal and holiness under his wings, to foster them all, to encourage them all, to direct and guide them all, and to make them all unite in brotherly concord for carrying out the great work of the Gospel. To appoint a Bishop on the ground that he is strongly opposed to any party, would, it seems to me, be utterly reprehensible. Assuredly too we have a right to expect, that he, whose name, both personally and hereditarily, is so connected with the cause of Toleration, should not violate the principles of Toleration, and should studiously guard against every kind of exclusiveness, in administering the power with which he may be entrusted in our Church.

If this caution be observed, which the aptness of good men in England to be carried into indiscreet, and even offensive extremes by party-spirit, often leads them to neglect, we have great reason for thankfulness in finding a Minister openly declaring that he desires to uphold the security of the Church, by "an able and learned episcopal Bench, and a zealous and God-fearing Clergy." This very morning I was reading an article in the last Number of the

English Review, in which it is askt (p. 446), amid a number of similar remarks, whether the Church can be "content to sit still, and to see men made Bishops merely because they have been private tutors in one great family, schoolmasters to another, college-tutors to a third, or cousins to a fourth." Now this melancholy description may in some degree represent the state of the episcopal bench in the eighteenth century, but is far from being a just picture of the appointments made during the last twenty years. Still it is very gratifying to find a Prime Minister publicly avowing that he purposes to act on a wholly different principle. At the same time, as Lord John Russell has exprest an opinion that I ought in candour to allow, that, "if such means as have been taken to ruin the reputation of Dr Hampden, are to deprive a clergyman of those distinctions, which our Church boasts of maintaining as the rewards of learning and piety, a fatal blow is struck at all profound enquiry, at all enlightened pursuit of truth, at all clerical independence;" I will take leave to observe that these words seem to me to imply an erroneous conception of the episcopal office. The errour is indeed quite excusable in a layman; for it has been, and still is, sadly prevalent among the Clergy, so prevalent that even good men have seemed to think that a mitre ought to be a reward or prize to be gained by learning, yea, by piety; as though it were possible for piety to aim at any earthly prize, as though the very notion of such an aim were not destructive to it, as though it were not its own exceeding great reward. But even learning, even the highest theological eminence, it seems to me, is a poor title or qualification for the episcopate. Often indeed it is quite the reverse. For what would a mitre have been to Hooker, except a crushing weight of misery? The fundamental errour however, to which I referred, is that of calling a Bishopric a reward. In

a certain sense, doubtless, it is so,—in the sense in which God rewards His servants for doing His work in a small sphere, by raising them to do it in a larger sphere, by placing him who has gained the five talents over five cities. But the errour is to regard a Bishopric as a reward or prize for work already done, as an office of wealth and dignity, to which a person may mount, for the sake of enjoying rest and ease, after he has earned it by laborious exertions; whereas the true description of the office is that contained in St Paul's words: *If a man desire the office of a Bishop, he desireth a good work:* and the emphasis should be laid on the last word. Our Bishops are now aware of this; and to that *work* they are zealously devoting themselves. But the old notion is still lingering among the Laity: else we should not have had a Bishop's office called a sinecure in the last session of Parliament. Hence also it follows that the main specific qualification for a Bishop, though of course piety and a certain amount of learning are also essential, is that temper and frame of heart and mind which fit a man for exercising the office of government in the Church,—in other words, that Christian wisdom and love, of which I spoke before, that union of the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove, which our Lord required of His Apostles. For a Bishop ought to be appointed, not for his own good, for his own glory or profit, in return for any merits or services, but solely and entirely for the good of the Church, especially of the Diocese over which he is set: and his highest dignity is to fulfill the mission of Him who came, not to be ministered to, but to minister.

Nor, on the other hand, can I find any comfort in that view of the present agitation, which has led some to lift up triumphant peans on account of it. Thus a writer in the last number of *the Christian Remembrancer*, after speaking of the conduct of the Chapter of Hereford,

bursts out into the following rapture (p. 243): "These great struggles tell a high lesson of faith and patience.—Who could have thought that such high and enthusiastic displays of feeling, as we have lately had, could have been elicited by one dull, mischievous book? We get into fixt habits of thought and assumption,—that nothing can break through the hard system of centuries. And then a single act of duty breaks the fatal spell: the world of unrealities and sophistries and make-shifts is disenchanted; and high thoughts come into the Church's mind.—The Church's inner life comes out; and the cold mist of apathy lifts; and the bright blue heavens, and sharp mountain-peaks of progress are disclosed. Such is the might and mystery of duty and self-sacrifice." In like manner a writer in *the English Review*, though of a soberer cast of mind, says (p. 431): "We cannot but express our deep sense, our firm conviction, that the hand of God has brought to pass what we now behold.—We regard what we see as a mighty movement, which is regenerating the Church, teaching it to know its vitality and its power, uniting its scattered energies, and exorcizing the demon of distrust and discord, which had for years impeded its progress.—The Church of England, which was three months ago apparently divided, broken, and dispirited, has, by the threatened appointment of an unsound divine to the Episcopate, suddenly awakened with the strength, as it were, of a giant refresht with wine, and with a unanimity and a cordial mingling together of all sections and parties—has resisted the will of the powers that be, in the cause of violated and endangered faith." These are grand words, grand visions. Would that I could see any answering realities! But, alas, I can see little in all this ferment, except what fills me with sorrow and shame.

Had this union arisen from an enlightened, conscientious purpose to uphold the truth, it would indeed have been

worthy of high praise and thankfulness. But we know too well that men are more easily stirred by evil impulses than by good, collectively, as well as individually. For my own part I have rather been reminded of the uproar which arose when St Paul declared that he had been sent to preach to the Gentiles. And do we not read that, on occasion of the foulest crime ever committed, they *all* cried out, *Let Him be crucified.* Unanimity therefore is no criterion of right, unless it be the unanimity of intelligent and dispassionate judges. Now that the former requisite is wanting in this case, I have never seen questioned: I have never seen it pretended that a tenth of the condemners of the Bampton Lectures have read them. But what is the worth of an opinion pronounced by a person ignorant of the matter on which he is pronouncing? Is it not just zero? And how many zeros does it take to make up a single unit? This problem may be proposed to the ingenuity of those who boast so much of the numbers of Dr Hampden's opponents. Nay, the numbers themselves are greatly exaggerated. Lord John Manners, in his Letter to Lord John Russell, talks of ninety-nine hundredths of the English Clergy. Now the Archbishop of Dublin has shewn, with his usual cleverness, how easily a small number of active and noisy persons may grow to be regarded as the great majority of a body. I do not mean that the number of Clergy who have remonstrated or petitioned on this occasion, is small. But, so far as I have any means of judging, the number who have taken an active and prominent part in the agitation, is by no means large: and these have induced many to join them, some out of deference to the decree of the Oxford Convocation,—some by means of those Propositions, the fallaciousness of the main part of which I think I may assume to have been proved,—others through the persuasion

that the great body of the Bishops were averse to the appointment, and desirous of being supported by the concurrence of their Clergy. For this mode of circular argumentation has been running round and round continually. The Clergy remonstrate, because the Bishops deem Dr Hampden a heretic. The Bishops remonstrate, because the Clergy deem Dr Hampden a heretic. Meanwhile few have thought of taking the plain, honest, conscientious course of examining his writings to ascertain whether he is so. Still I am thankful to say, that, among the Clergy of my own Archdeaconry, so far as I have had any means of judging, the greater part have wisely abstained from engaging in this agitation; many of them, I conceive, from the conviction that they ought not to pass judgement without previous enquiry; while several have informed me that, having read the Bampton Lectures, they had seen the groundlessness of the charges against them. Nor do I know of any reason for supposing that the same has not been the case in other parts of England. On the contrary, I have received some satisfactory evidence that it has been; and of the various persons with whom I have converst or corresponded on the subject, all, with one or two exceptions, who spoke of having read the Bampton Lectures with attention, have told me that the opinion they had formed was decidedly favorable to the Author. Among these have been several persons as well qualified to pronounce on such a subject as any man in England. I will only cite my dear and honoured friend Dr Whewell, who, in answer to a letter wherein I spoke of the Introduction to the Second Edition as having satisfied me that the Author's meaning and purpose had been wholly misconceived, said, "I have not seen the Introduction of which you speak; but I never could find anything in Dr Hampden, except a pious and learned man, whose

acquaintance with theological history made him take a special view of the value of certain expressions." I quote these words, because they represent the real character of the Bampton Lectures so plainly and truly, that they may be of use to any one who will sit down to study that work, with the desire of forming a correct judgement upon it. To me they were a great support and encouragement, at a time when I fancied myself almost alone in my conviction, and opposed to a host of celebrated names. Nearly the same conviction has since been exprest by the Bishop of Oxford. But Dr Whewell, in consequence of his familiarity with all the forms and modes of philosophical thought, and more especially with speculations on the influence they have exercised upon language, came at once years ago to the conclusion, with that quicksightedness which marks a master in every province of knowledge.

As a further instance of the manner in which this conclusion seems to force itself upon the mind of every candid enquirer, I will quote the following passage from an excellent Letter to the Archdeacon of Sarum, publisht by Mr Eliot, the late Archdeacon of Barbados. " When the attempt was made to nullify Dr Hampden's appointment to the Professorship of Divinity in Oxford, I happened to be in the West Indies.—The pamphlets, containing the obnoxious extracts from his Bampton Lectures, were sent to me from this country. My first impression on seeing them was unfavorable to Dr Hampden; and at the moment I considered that he deserved the censure of the University. On reading however the works from which the extracts had been taken, I discovered so much unfairness,—such a suppression of all that was favorable, with the attempt to give an undue prominency to passages which in their isolation from the context seemed unfavorable,—such perverted ingenuity in drawing inferences,

which were never contemplated by the writer, but which, notwithstanding, were exhibited to the public as his deliberate opinions, that I at once regarded Dr Hampden as a calumniated and much injured man. I have examined his Parochial Sermons, publisht in 1828, before he was appointed Divinity Professor; I have read his Inaugural and other Lectures and Sermons, publisht subsequently to his appointment; I have brought them to bear in the way of explanation, on whatever might seem to be ambiguous in his Bampton Lectures and other works which I have seen; and I can arrive at no other conclusion, han that he maintains, in full sincerity, all the doctrines of the Church of England.—In saying thus much, I am not pledged to defend every abstruse reasoning or obscure expression in his works. There can be errours in argument and illustration, which are quite consistent with orthodoxy of belief, and integrity of intention." Here we have a pattern set before us of what an upright Christian minister will do, before he condemns a brother. How many thousand zeros would it take to counterbalance the judgement here pronounced by Archdeacon Eliot!

But it is time to turn to the objections which have been made to my Letter from the opposite side. It was to be expected that the link boy in *the English Churchman* would set up a yell; and accordingly he has done so lustily, and has shewn an inclination to have another heretic-hunt, of which I am to be the object. But of him I will say nothing further, except that, while journals conducted in such a tone and spirit are sanctioned and supported by the Clergy, and are regarded, one must fear, by many as guides, it is in vain to look for peace or candour in the Church.

I must not however pass in like manner over Mr Trower, who has publisht a Pamphlet of considerable

length, entitled "Plain Remarks" on my Letter. For he has come forward with his name: he is a Rural Dean in our own Diocese, though in the other Archdeaconry: he is highly esteemed, I believe, by all his acquaintance; and I know that he is so by my dear brother Archdeacon, whom the state of his health has removed, happily it may be for him, but perhaps unhappily for us, from this scene of turbulence: and, though my own intercourse with him has been very slight, it is plain, even on the evidence of this Pamphlet, that he is an amiable, well-meaning, and, to a certain extent, a conscientious man. Why I say, *to a certain extent*, will appear anon. On the other hand he allows his zeal to carry him often beyond his tether, and speaks hastily and inconsiderately, and without sufficient knowledge, on matters requiring greater clearness and nicety and tension of thought than he is wont to apply to them.

His Pamphlet is preceded by a "Prefatory Notice" of Lord John Russell's Letter, of which I have been speaking, coucht in language not altogether in accordance with the honour which we are commanded to pay to our civil superiors. In this however, though it is a point as to which zealous Churchmen too often forget the precepts of the New Testament, I am not immediately concerned. But there is one passage in this Prefatory Notice, so strongly exemplifying the habits of thought and feeling prevalent in the party by whom our Church is now agitated that I will cite it.

In p. 10, Mr Trower says: "The Minister assumes, or asserts, that 'an enlightened pursuit of truth,' and 'clerical independence,' are the qualifications for the episcopate. Is Divine Truth then still *to be discovered?* or is it not rather TO BE DEFENDED? This expression indeed may not grate on the feelings of Archdeacon Hare, who, if I

mistake not, is the joint author of a work, called 'Guesses at Truth.' I never read that work; but, whenever I have heard the title, I have thought it a singularly unhappy one, so far as applied by a clergyman to religious truths." This passage will explain why I said that Mr Trower is *to a certain extent* a conscientious man. A strictly conscientious man would have refrained from indulging in a sneer at a brother clergyman,—which, when coupled with other passages in the Pamphlet, is plainly designed to imply that this brother clergyman has not a sufficient reverence for religious truths,—on the strength of the title of a work, of which his remark shews, and he himself confesses, that he knows nothing. He assumes, just as hundreds, nay, thousands, have assumed with regard to Dr Hampden, that a few words, which they look at independently of their connexion and purpose, mean something very mischievous; they put their own sense on these words; they do not take the trouble to enquire in what sense the author uses them: but the sense which they attach to the words, offends them; and so, without more ado, they condemn the writer as a heretic, or as a clergyman who "applies a singularly unhappy expression to religious truths." Had Mr Trower lookt at the book referred to, —which he might have ascribed to me without hesitation, inasmuch as my name is subjoined to the Dedication and the Preface of the later editions, though, from love for the original title-page, I would not alter it,—he would have seen that it does not consist of speculations about religious truths, as if these were a matter of doubt and guessing, though it does now and then try to follow them out into some of their consequences; but that rather, as I trust, it takes its stand upon religious truths, and that one of its main purposes is to illustrate and enforce their bearing on various questions of morals, politics, literature,

manners. Still, though Mr Trower's sneer was intended to injure, he is too simple-hearted to injure, even when he intends it. *Telum imbelle sine ictu Conjecit.* Or rather it recoils upon himself: for every intelligent reader will see at once, that he has violated the Scriptural law of not judging, and the law of conscience, which enjoins us to utter no word, least of all a word injurious to another, without a well-grounded conviction of its truth.

But further, what is the meaning of this shrinking from such an expression as "an enlightened pursuit of truth?" which Mr Trower thinks may not grate on my feelings, hardened as they are by the dreadful habit of guessing at truth, but which, he of course implies, does grate on his, and ought to grate on those of a rightminded clergyman. Every educated Englishman has at least read the first of Bacon's *Essays*, unless Mr Trower forms an exception, from having been withheld by horrour at *an Essay on Truth*. In that Essay he may find some remarks which might be very useful to him, and to all such as think like him in this matter. After asking why people are not more diligent in the pursuit of Truth, Bacon says: "This same Truth is a naked and open daylight, that doth not shew the masks and mummeries and triumphs of the world half so stately and daintily as candle-lights.—A mixture of a lie doth ever add pleasure. Doth any man doubt, that, if there were taken out of men's minds vain opinions, flattering hopes, false valuations, imaginations as one would, and the like, but it would leave the minds of a number of men poor shrunken things, full of melancholy and indisposition, and unpleasing to themselves?—But howsoever these things are thus in men's depraved judgements and affections, yet Truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth, that the enquiry of Truth, which is the love-making or wooing of it, the knowledge of Truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of Truth, which

is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign Good of human nature." But, says Mr Trower, "is Divine Truth *to be discovered?* or is it not rather TO BE DEFENDED?" Yes, assuredly, it is to be defended: but it is also to be discovered: and one of the main ways of defending it is by discovering it. In fact how can we defend it, until we have discovered it? Not to the Apostles alone, but to the Church in all ages, was the promise of the Spirit given, to *guide us to the whole Truth.* For, though the Truth is one, and ever the same, it is also infinite, full of infinite riches, capable of infinite expansion, of infinite, ever-varying applications to new forms of life, to new modes of thought, capable of animating and vivifying every condition of human intelligence or feeling. Errours too are continually springing up in every age, growing like suckers from the Truth itself, as planted in an earthly soil, errours sprouting out of those dogmatical tendencies which Dr Hampden so strongly combats: and these can only be eradicated by our discovering the Truth, and separating it from them, by shewing when and where and how they diverge, and through what perverse strainings of particular truths they have gained ground. Verily it would be a kind of death-warrant to a Church, to declare that Truth is no longer to be pursued in it. Evils will indeed result from an erroneous pursuit, as from every other perverted blessing: but these can only be overcome by our persevering, with God's help, diligently and undauntedly in the pursuit, trusting to the promist aid of His Spirit, and in the assurance that here also the Divine Law will be fulfilled, that they who seek shall find. It was by hoodwinking the intellectual eye, by checking and repressing the pursuit of Truth, that the Church of Rome almost quencht the Spirit within her. We may be blinded indeed by gazing rashly at the light; but we are sure to

be blinded by living in darkness; and even though we retained our eyesight, we could not see. By wrapping up the Truth in a napkin, we shall not preserve it, or discharge the duty which our being entrusted with it imposes upon us. We must put it out to use; we must make more with it. The more we have, the more we ought to make, and the more we shall make; whereas, from those who have not, from those who think they have only to keep it lockt up and defended, will be taken away even that which they seem to have. When they look into their chest, they will find nothing in it but a mummy. For, though Death may be deemed a safe keeper, as he never lets anything escape from his clutches, that which he clutches moulders in his grasp. Most rightly also does Coleridge urge (*Friend*, i. p. 135): "The inspired writings received by Christians are distinguishable from all other books pretending to inspiration, from the scriptures of the Brahmins, and even from the Koran, in their strong and frequent recommendations of Truth. I do not here mean veracity, which cannot but be enforced in every code which appeals to the religious principle of man, but knowledge. This is not only extolled as the crown and honour of a man; but to seek after it is again and again commanded us as one of our most sacred duties." Butler too, in an excellent passage of *the Analogy* (p. II. c. 3), insists on the necessity of *pursuing* and *discovering* truth, in order to a right understanding of Scripture: "The more distinct and particular knowledge of those things, the study of which the Apostle calls *going on to perfection*, and of the prophetic parts of Revelation, like many parts of natural and even civil knowledge, may require very exact thought, and careful consideration.—And as, it is owned, the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so, if it ever comes to be understood, before *the restitution of all*

things, and without miraculous interpositions, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at; by the continuance and progress of learning and of liberty, *and by particular persons attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations scattered up and down it,* which are overlookt and disregarded by the generality of the world. For this is the way in which all improvements are made, *by thoughtful men's tracing on obscure hints,* as it were, dropt us by nature accidentally, or which seem to come into our minds by chance. Nor is it at all incredible, that a book, which has been so long in the possession of mankind, *should contain many truths as yet undiscovered.*—And possibly it might be intended, that events, as they come to pass, should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of Scripture." It may appear strange to have to vindicate the pursuit of Truth in these days; but an excess in whatsoever direction is always followed by a reaction. There are very many now to whom Bacon's above-cited description is singularly applicable, many who, having at one time been bit by the mad-dog of Rationalism, have been infected ever after with a kind of alethophobia.

These observations, though suggested by a passage not immediately connected with our subject, have a close bearing on the whole spirit which has been kindling the present agitation. But to turn from the Preface, in which I am only brought in by the way, to the Plain Remarks on my Letter: the first Remark relates merely to my style. Mr Trower complains of what he calls my "comic allusions." This is a question of taste, the discussion of which would be out of place here. I will only observe, that, as, after quoting my application (in p. 6) of the appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, he says, "Dr Hampden will be flattered by the illustration," he does not seem peculiarly qualified for judging even of

"comic allusions." What meaning he may have attacht to my words, it is not easy to conceive; though he would hardly have relisht them more, had he understood them better.

To stumble at the threshold is always a bad omen. As Mr Trower, before he gets through half a page, has so strangely misconceived the first words he quotes from my Letter, one is led to think there must be some mist before his eyes, which will hardly clear up as he proceeds. Nor does his latter end belie his beginning: *servatur ad imum, Qualis ab incepto processerat, et sibi constat.* In the next page he picks out certain expressions that I have used, *effrontery, clamour, ignorance, dishonest* and *perfidious citation*, and *envenomed ferocity*, and complains of my "applying such terms as these to the large body of my brother clergymen, who have protested against Dr Hampden's elevation to the Episcopate, including many names distinguisht for learning, piety, and ability." Were it not for the mist before his eyes, he must have seen that I have done nothing of the sort. The word *effrontery* (p. 20) is applied to a particular act of a particular person. The expressions, *a dishonest extract* (p. 34), *a perfidious citation* (p. 50), it is plain on their face, refer to specific acts, and no way touch any one except the maker of the extracts. That, as so applied, they are at all too severe, I cannot see: nor do I see any good, but much evil, in mincing the language of reprobation, when such conduct is pursued. If men of eminence are involved therein, it only becomes so much the worse, worse as an example, worse, far worse, because it cannot be pleaded that they sinned out of that ignorance and confusion, which are ever sure to rise up when controversies are astir. Be it remembered too, that this most dishonest and fallacious series of Propositions, professing to be extracted from Dr

Hampden's writings, is not like the misrepresentations, resulting from the eclipse of the intellect by the passions, which are so common in all disputes,—that they were brought forward with the sanction of a body,—that, though their real character was exposed by such devout lovers of truth as Dr Arnold and Mr Hull, they were made the ground of a bitter persecution,—and that now, after more than eleven years, they have been revived, with all their falsehood still cleaving to them, for the sake of drawing our whole Church to engage in the same persecution. Is it a sin against Christian love to speak with severe condemnation of such conduct? That mawkish substitute for Christian love, which gains currency in the world, and which does not like to see people disturbed in their self-complacent dreams, has a dread of plain and strong words. But this is not according to the pattern set before us in Scripture, even by him who is especially called the Apostle of Love. With this example, I need not seek further justification in that of wise and good men in all ages; though I readily admit that, if I had applied these words, as Mr Trower accuses me of doing, to the great body of Dr Hampden's opponents, I should have been a shameless slanderer. But I have not. Nor was the expression, *envenomed ferocity* (p. 44), applied, except to "some of Dr Hampden's enemies." It was occasioned by an instance of that enmity, which, I think, fully justified it. But as it did not seem advisable to speak of that particular act, I regretted having used words, which in any indefinite application would rightly be deemed exaggerated; and I have altered them in this edition. The others I have seen no reason to soften. Nor have I left out the words *clamour* and *ignorance* in p. 23. That there has been an abundance of the former, the ears of all England bear witness. That there has been an enormous

mass of the latter,—that is to say, of ignorance with regard to the specific merits of this whole case, of persons who have taken part in the agitation without any adequate knowledge of the grounds of it, is, I conceive, undeniable. Against those who "conscientiously believe," that is, after due pains to establish the correctness of their belief, "that Dr Hampden is a teacher of unsound opinions," and who have not made use of any immoral artifices in propagating that belief, I have not said a word. Of course I think them mistaken, and, having been led to enter into this argument, must needs try to prove that they are so; but conscientiousness, however mistaken, I always respect. Above all, in times of party strife, if it be strict and scrupulous, one is compelled to do so, were it only for its exceeding rarity.

To Mr Trower's next charge, of inconsistency, as displayed in my change of opinion on the conduct of the Minister, I have already replied. He then makes out a list of what he calls my "admissions," with regard to objectionable matter to be found in Dr Hampden's writings, and begins by quoting what I say in p. 10; where, after asking the question whether there is any heresy in them, I add: "To such a question it is not easy to reply with an absolute negative. It would be a long and laborious task to hunt out every inkling of a heresy, through every clause of every sentence, in a long, learned, and argumentative volume." Hereupon he observes: "I note this sentence, because it seems to me to betray so great a consciousness on the part of this very unflinching champion of Dr Hampden, that heretical opinion does at least lurk in his writings. The Archdeacon seems to think this must be expected in a long, learned, and argumentative work." Here Mr Trower misunderstands my meaning, as with his bias he perhaps naturally might. If I had had any

"consciousness that heretical opinions do lurk in Dr Hampden's writings," I should have acted dishonestly in speaking as I have done; though I altogether disclaim the title of an "unflinching champion;"—for, as I have already said, I have no personal acquaintance with him, and was rather prejudiced against his writings, when I first took them up. Still too I have no immediate concern in his opinions, from which my own on several main questions both of philosophy and theology differ very materially. In defending him I wrote solely from a desire to vindicate what appeared to me the cause of Truth and Justice, and under a sense of the duty imposed on me by my position in the Church. As to the expressions just quoted, they were intended, and, I hoped, would be understood to mean, that, desiring to weigh my words, and not to speak with more confidence than I felt justified in assuming, I could not take upon me to pronounce a general judgement with regard to a long, learned, and argumentative volume, which, as such, would require more time and thought to examine it thoroughly, in the details of all its reasonings, than was compatible with the necessity of publishing my Letter as speedily as possible, if it was to answer its purpose of helping people to discern the unreasonableness of the agitation so deplorably prevalent. For this purpose it seemed to me sufficient, if I could shew the groundlessness of the specific charges brought against Dr Hampden by his opponents: for, as these were the only pleas for the opposition to him, if they were removed, that too ought to fall to the ground. Yet Mr Trower, from his irresistible proneness to twist an opponent's words into something suited to his purpose, soon after (p. 20) represents me as admitting, that, "if askt, Is there no heresy in Dr Hampden's writings, it would be impossible —(my words were, *not easy*,)—to reply with an absolute

negative;" and "that, if he does not mistake my meaning, a laborious search would enable an investigator *to discover many inklings of heresy* in so long and argumentative a work." When such plain words are thus distorted, no wonder that Mr Trower can find heresy, or anything else, wherever he chooses to look for it.

The next "admission, "which Mr Trower alledges, is taken from p. 20; where, after quoting a long passage from the eighth Lecture, I say, that "there is some questionable matter in it, especially about the real value of Dogmatical Theology." Shortly afterward this "admission" reappears under the shape, "that, in the Regius Professor's views of the terminology of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, there is some questionable matter, especially as to the value of Dogmatic Theology." Now the very reason why I thus limited my words with regard to what I deemed questionable in the passage quoted, was to indicate that I did not regard that portion of it as questionable which relates to the terminology of the Creeds; and accordingly I added, that "no one acquainted with the history of Theology will controvert the statement of the origin of the definitions contained in our Creeds and Articles;" whereas from Mr Trower's representation it would seem that I had admitted the existence of questionable matter in the views of the terminology of the Creeds, which I expressly stated to be incontrovertible. It is quite impossible to discuss the manifold questions, which start up at every turn in the course of this argument: therefore I confined myself as nearly as possible to barely shewing that the charges brought against the Bampton Lectures were a most unfaithful representation of their meaning. This was all that was requisite for the immediate object. Here however I may add, that, though my own studies have led me to form a very different

estimate of the value of Dogmatical Theology, I am no way surprised that Dr Hampden should depreciate it. For it is a department in which our Church has been almost barren during the last century and a half. We have had many proofs indeed of the evils of the systematical spirit, but hardly any of its benefits. It is very easily accountable too that a person who had formed his views of philosophy and theology, as Dr Hampden so evidently did, in the school of Butler, should have come to this conclusion. I do not mean, that this is at all a necessary consequence from Butler's principles, or one that he himself drew. On the contrary that most cautious and judicious thinker is continually reminding his readers of the true nature and force and limits of his argument,—that it is merely supplementary to the arguments derived from other processes of reasoning, and that its real value is to remove objections against religion, by shewing that the difficulties complained of in this province receive a full explanation and justification from the analogous difficulties found in the natural world. But, though Butler himself is thus careful and guarded, many of his disciples have lost sight of his limitations, and have attacht an exclusive value to that which in fact is merely a negative proof. Hence, through the misapplication and perversion of Butler's mode of reasoning, many errours have arisen,—some discernible in the earlier Oriel school, which issued from that of Butler, and to which Dr Hampden belonged,—others apparent in the later Oriel offset from the same school, and of which we may see manifold instances in Mr Newman's writings, and several in Mr Keble's Preface to his recent volume of Sermons. But of these I must defer speaking, as they would lead me into a long digression, and are of too great importance to be treated cursorily. With regard to Dogmatical Theology however, according to the establisht

meaning of the term, the tendency of Butler's disciples to repudiate it, from supposing that their master intended to occupy the whole realm of Theology, instead of merely fortifying a part of its outskirts against its enemies, is manifested quite as strongly in Mr Keble's Preface, as in any of Dr Hampden's writings. The former seems possest throughout with a sort of horrour of *a priori* reasoning, as though it were rationalism, and the parent of all evil. Yet without it Dogmatical Theology can have no existence; that is, as I have just said, according to the usual signification of the term. Dr Hampden indeed, at the beginning of his Lecture on the Articles, says, that "this appellation denotes rather the several formal propositions of which our theological System consists, than the whole sum of them, which is what we mean when we speak of Systematic Theology." This distinction may prevail at Oxford; but it is not recognised in the ordinary language of divines: hence it may happen that I have been misunderstood, from using the term Dogmatic Theology, in its common acceptation, as equivalent to Systematic Theology.

Here, as I have been led to speak of the relation in which Dr Hampden's philosophy stands to Butler's, let me add, that this fact entirely disproves the doubts which have so strangely been thrown on the authorship of the Bampton Lectures. An ingenious writer in *the Times,* wishing, as it would seem, to try how far the credulity of his readers would follow him, has made out a regular history, garnisht with dates and anecdotes, to prove that the Bampton Lectures were not written by Dr Hampden, but by Blanco White,—that they are "as much the products of Mr B. White's mind, as certain works penned by Xenophon and Plato are virtually the thoughts of Socrates. There is indeed (he allows) a considerable difference of style between the Lectures and Mr B. White's

publisht works, even on the same subjects." This however does not startle him ; for " they who were acquainted with that extraordinary person, will remember that he talkt and wrote very differently. He spoke with vigour and terseness, and with his eye upon his subject." How far this corresponds to the style of the Bampton Lectures, others may determine. Had this piece of conjectural history been confined to a daily newspaper, it would hardly have deserved serious notice, however great the influence of that newspaper may be. But it has been reprinted, as though it were authentic, in monthly and quarterly journals, and has found credence, as any story will, if there are a number of echoes to repeat it. Of course too its effect, if not its benevolent design, has been to breed the suspicion that the Bampton Lectures convey Blanco White's errours. As to the fact, after the conclusive contradiction it has received from the Archbishop of Dublin, who can speak with more authority than any man living on this subject, it would be worse than *actum agere*, for me, ignorant as I am of the times and persons, to say anything. But it may not be superfluous to observe, that the *Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, which, I believe, was Dr Hampden's first work, and was publisht in 1827, that is, four or five years anterior to the period when our fabulist surmises that he was drinking in inspiration at the feet of his Spanish Gamaliel, is written manifestly and confessedly with the view of carrying out and applying the principles of Butler's *Analogy*, and contains the germs of the chief speculations in the Bampton Lectures. They too who are at all acquainted with the writings of what was then called the Oriel School, will easily perceive that the Bampton Lectures, in their whole tone of thought, both philosophical and theological, are a genuine birth of that school, and did not need a refugee from Seville

to graft them into it. Moreover, though our feelings and opinions are sure to be modified more or less by those with whom we live familiarly, and so far Dr Hampden's may have been by his intercourse with Blanco White, there is a unity in the tone and spirit of the work, which bespeaks the unity of its author. Its learning too bespeaks original research, altogether independent of the French writers, who are asserted, on no adequate grounds, to have supplied the materials for it.

Mr Trower next tries to obtain another "admission" from what I have said in p. 39; which he represents thus: "After quoting the passage in which Dr Hampden places the Unitarian on the same footing *precisely* of earnest religious zeal, and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which he would place any other Christian, the Archdeacon says, 'In this passage, *as in several others, treating on the same subject* [what subject? the sense in which Unitarians are to be called Christians?], along with much important truth, there seems to me to be an admixture of errour." Here, distressing as it is to find fault with every sentence, as if one were correcting a schoolboy's exercise, I must observe that Dr Hampden does not "place the Unitarian on the same footing of earnest religious zeal, and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which he would place any other Christian." He would have been talking sheer nonsense, if he had spoken of earnest religious zeal and a love for Christ, as the ordinary accompaniments of any form of doctrine. What he says is merely hypothetical. The hypothetical use of the participle is a very common idiom: *putting*, or *if we put*, a Unitarian on the same footing,—supposing a Unitarian to have the same religious zeal and love for Christ,—I would ask him, &c. This is very different from Mr Trower's version of the sentence, and far less paradoxical and offensive; though still, for my

own part, I cannot see how Dr Hampden could suppose a case, in which so enormous a difference of belief concerning our Lord's nature and office and relation to us should make no difference in a person's feelings towards Him; and I conceive therefore that in this passage of his Pamphlet he exprest himself hastily and inaccurately. Mr Trower's parenthetical query shews how he is ever run away with, or, to speak more correctly, held fast by a fixt notion. Instead of looking at the principles which a passage enunciates, he can see nothing but some inference which offends him. I am not aware of any other passages, where Dr Hampden speaks of the sense in which Unitarians are to be called Christians; but he speaks several times of the Facts of Christianity, as being the main objects of Christian faith, rather than the dogmas deduced from them; and to the passages on this subject was I referring, when I spoke of him as having a somewhat indistinct apprehension of the very truth he is proclaiming, namely, that the ground and centre of all Christian union is, not agreement in a system of doctrines, but the Person of the Incarnate Son of God, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind. This too Mr Trower regards as a very important "admission." Yet how few divines have had a clear apprehension of this truth! Mr Trower's whole Pamphlet plainly shews that he has not. It was recognised indeed, as I have said, by the early Church, when the Apostles Creed was made the universal Confession. So too is it recognised by implication still, in the ordinance that this Creed should be the baptismal profession of every Christian. But the history of the Church is filled with controversies and struggles, caused by the desire of imposing institutions and forms and dogmas, as absolutely essential, and by the refusal of Christian communion to those who will not adopt them. A wisdom far above man's

has indeed directed the Church, and preserved her from enjoining these additions on all her members. Some of them too have been generally acknowledged to be variable, according to the discretion of national Churches; and others have been regarded as solely requisite for the guidance of her ministers. Still the right distinction between that which is indispensable for every Christian, and that which the authority of particular Churches is entitled to demand from their appointed teachers, for the sake of guarding the truth from dogmatical perversions, and repelling the assaults of errour, has seldom been clearly understood.

As this passage is one of those most calculated to give general offense, Mr Trower returns to it in p. 41, and quotes Dr Hampden's words thus: "In religion, properly so called, few Christians, if any, [it is plain by what follows, that Dr Hampden includes Unitarians in this expression] I speak of course of pious minds, really differ." Then, after transcribing the next two sentences, he adds, with a mark of admiration: "Thus far, says the Archdeacon (!) I conceive all men of intelligent and candid minds would agree with Dr Hampden;" and hereby he plainly means to insinuate that I intended to express my agreement with Dr Hampden in holding that there is no essential difference in religious feeling between Unitarians and orthodox Christians. Whereas my very reason for stopping short where I did, was, that the preceding words, standing alone,—*thus far*, as I say,—would merely express, what has often been said without reproof, that, in spite of the differences and divisions by which the Church of Christ has been so wofully torn, there has ever been an essential agreement and unity among all truly earnest and pious men, such, for instance, as Augustin, and Fenelon, and Pascal, and Hooker, and Leighton, and

Melanchthon, and Baxter, and Howe, and Spener, and Zinzendorf. Why will not Mr Trower take a little pains to consider, whether the words he is examining will not admit of an innocent meaning, before he puts an offensive one upon them? I had expressly drawn a distinction between the former part of the paragraph, with which, if it stood alone, most good men, I imagined, would agree, and the latter portion, which treats of the extreme case of the Unitarians.

Moreover, I cannot but think, that there is a great deal of hypocrisy, unconscious indeed in many, and self-deceiving, in the clamour against Dr Hampden for granting the name of Christians to Unitarians. I myself indeed have always concurred with Coleridge and Arnold in thinking that it could not be appropriately applied to them, as a body; though individual members of that body may have many Christian graces. Dr Hampden too says, in his Letter to Lord John Russell: "If on any occasion I have ventured to call Unitarians Christians, surely this must be understood in the wide charitable sense of the term; not in that strict sense in which it belongs to a believer in the Divinity and blessed Atonement of our Lord; but in a sense not unlike that in which it is used in our Liturgy, when we pray for *all who profess and call themselves Christians*, that they may be led into the way of truth." Surely too he is not the only person in our days, who uses the name in this enlarged sense. For what is the main argument urged by those who oppose the admission of Jews into the Legislature? but that the Legislature would thereby cease to be a Christian body. In the force of this argument I entirely agree; and so, I am happy to find, does Mr Trower, who, in his Letter to Lord John Russell, makes this his main stay: "From the day (he says) on which that measure may be adopted, the character

of England as a Christian nation, governed by a Christian Legislature, and bearing on her front the cross of Christ, as her hope and glory, will be among things that have past away." And again, after complaining of the admission of Romanists, he adds: "As yet however we profess, as a nation, the truth of Christianity.—Our legislators have at least been required to profess the faith of a Christian." Consequently there must plainly be a sense in which Unitarians may be spoken of as Christians; a sense in which they are allowed by Parliament to make a declaration *on the faith of a Christian.* Let us beware then of condemning another for using a word in a meaning, which we ourselves attach to it, when we can build an argument upon it in favour of our cause.

The last "admission," which Mr Trower claims on the authority of my Letter, is taken from p 57, where, he says, "the Archdeacon appears to admit that Dr Hampden's doctrine on original sin is defective, though he is pleased to say, the point in dispute belongs more to the philosophical than to the religious side of theology." In the next page he repeats, that, "in excuse for Dr Hampden's statements on original sin, it should be borne in mind, in Archdeacon Hare's opinion, that the point in dispute, relates to the philosophical rather than the religious side of theology." Here we have another instance of that deplorable want of precision, which totally unfits Mr Trower for controversial argument. The reader of these two passages must needs suppose that I had said, that *original sin* is a question belonging more to the philosophical than to the religious side of theology; whereas the point under discussion was, not the fact of original sin, but, as I distinctly stated, *the mode in which sin is transmitted.* This then is the question which, I said, belongs rather to the philosophical than to the religious side of theology. Nor

had I said a word as to whether Dr Hampden's doctrine on the subject is or is not defective.

Such is the real force of the "admissions," on the strength of which Mr Trower thinks I ought to have hesitated, before I commended the Bampton Lectures as learned and thoughtful, and favorably distinguisht by their philosophical candour and sobriety. Is any of my "admissions" then inconsistent with those merits? or would it be so, even according to Mr Trower's estimate of them? Not a whit. But this is one of the miserable curses of party-spirit, that it leads us to judge of books, not by their intrinsic merits or demerits, but solely by their agreement with our own opinions. If we agree with them, we pronounce them good, however silly or extravagant they may be. If they differ from us, we are ready to call Plato a driveler, and Aristotle a blockhead. Thus we measure all the might and richness of the intellect, under its various manifestations, by the petty standard of our own narrow, dwarfish understandings, rendered rickety, it may also be, by the swathing bands in which they have been wrapt up.

According to Mr Trower however, these admissions "involve charges against Dr Hampden as grave as, or even more grave, because more specific, than are implied in the censure past upon him by the University of Oxford:" and since I have made these admissions, he thinks that Dr Hampden may well exclaim, *Save me from my friends!* Be it so: as I only came forward in behalf of Truth and Justice, no personal verdict will disturb me. In the previous words however Mr Trower has toucht on one of the points which prove the worthlessness of the censure past by the Oxford Convocation,—its being a vague, general declaration of a want of confidence, without any specific charge. In what court of justice would such a procedure be tolerated? though precedents for it might

doubtless be found in the acts of the Athenian mob, and of the French National Convention. Mr Trower's attempt to vindicate the authority of that decree is not very successful. Indeed he himself admits that the Convocation "is not a fitting tribunal to pronounce finally and judicially on theological doctrines." But he thinks that it has a certain right, arising from the right of Universities, which possess a faculty of Theology, to determine theological questions, and to censure theological propositions. This right however in the old Universities properly belonged to the Theological Faculty, not to the whole body of the University. The Theological Faculty were especially qualified to pronounce on such questions; and so their verdict, when given judicially, that is, after due enquiry and consideration, was held to be authoritative. But what qualifications have the great bulk of the Convocation? the country gentlemen, the lawyers, the physicians, the zeroes among the clergy, who, we may reasonably believe, formed nine tenths of the majority. Hence we see the real value of an argument, which has been urged, and has been highly applauded. In reply to the declaration that the Crown could not allow its supremacy to be controlled by a decree of the Convocation, it has been contended that the supremacy would have been controlled by a judgement of the Court of Queen's Bench; and this has been extolled as a triumphant answer to "transparent sophistry." Yet surely the sophistry,—which ought to have been transparent, if anything were so, whereby one hopes to trip up an adversary, even for a passing moment,—lies in the answer. For if the Crown were controlled by a judgement of a Court of Law, it would be controlled by its own act, the judge on the bench being invested with the majesty of royalty; and, according to the idea of the Constitution, the Crown cannot contradict itself. But the Convocation

in such a matter has no more lawful authority, than any other self-constituted tribunal, no more than a decision of the Common Council in Guildhall, scarcely more than a vote of the Carlton or Reform Club. Indeed, in trying to get over the objection, that the members of Convocation who condemned the Bampton Lectures had not read them, Mr Trower has only to plead, that, before the measure was submitted to Convocation, it had been adopted by the Board of Heads of Houses, who, we may presume, had; whose initiative sanction however can never be accounted equivalent to a formal judgement, even if they constituted a legal tribunal; and further, that they had been read by the members of the Corpus Committee, who "were all of them men of the highest personal character," and "united in a remarkable manner in the propriety and fairness of the extracts which they publisht to the world." Hence he maintains that "there was sufficient ground for the confidence which was generally conceded to them;" that, "in a case of this kind, young men who are entrusted with a vote are fully justified in exercising their privilege in deference to the University authorities, and the elder Clergy in whom they confide;" and that "this deference to authority, in the case of many men of moderate ability and acquirement, is more becoming, than to stand aloof from some great cause, the full bearings of which they are perhaps unable to estimate. That this principle (he says) *must* operate in the resolutions of such a body as the Convocation of Oxford, is self-evident." But what is all this, except to say that the Convocation is totally unfit to exercise any judicial authority? and that the votes of its members were so many zeroes tackt on to the opinions of the Corpus Committee, whose exemplary fairness in selecting their extracts must now become proverbial. With their personal character I have no concern. If it was eminent, their conduct is only a

more awful proof how gifts and graces are withered and blighted by the blasts of party-spirit.

On these grounds I cannot regard a censure by such a body, so disqualified, first by its constitution, and then by the general ignorance of the facts on which it was pronouncing, as "a bar to the elevation of him who has incurred it to the office of a Bishop." Nor can I accede to the notion exprest in George the Third's saying, which Mr Trower quotes, after the Bishop of Exeter, that "a Bishop should have nothing to retract." There is indeed a kind of recantation,—when a person abjures opinions which he has long held and maintained, and comes forward busily proclaiming opinions which he had previously condemned and denounced, for the purpose of gaining a mitre,—which rightfully renders a man an object of loathing. If Dr Hampden had recanted now, with this purpose in view, his merited portion would have been contempt; for he would have been guilty of the sin, which renders the name of apostate infamous above all names, of bartering his conscience for lucre. It was natural enough that George the Third, ignorant as he was of the difficulties and snares which beset the path of theological speculation, should think that a divine has nothing to do, save to stick fast to his Catechism from childhood to old age. I say not this disparagingly: it is a blessed thing when a man, in the maturity of his intellect, can feel the assurance, which Luther so beautifully expresses, that he has the sum of all truth in the simple lessons of his boyhood. But many are apt to wander. Those who really love truth, and do not take up their opinions on credit, as a mere matter of course, or for the sake of getting on in the world, will often stray into devious paths, before they are led into the right one. Nor is it consistent with the whole

spirit of Christianity, of Him who came, not to call the righteous, but sinners, into His kingdom, to enact an exclusion against those who may have fallen into erroneous opinions. On the contrary, it has often been seen that a convert becomes one of the ablest and most zealous preachers of the truth, as was evinced above all by St Paul: and it may be deemed a sufficient answer to that shallow apophthegm, to observe that it would have shut out Augustin from the Episcopate.

The fairness of the Propositions extracted from the Bampton Lectures, I should have thought, might be regarded as placed beyond a doubt. But, as Mr Trower can see nothing except evil in Dr Hampden's words and mine, he is equally clearsighted in the writings of those who agree with him. "There is nothing (he says) he would more wish, than that any one who suspects the fairness of the extracts, should turn to the volume from which they are taken." Here for once we are agreed. This is just what I called upon my brethren to do, that they might not join in an ignorant clamour. Nay, this is just what I did myself; and the results of my enquiry are set forth in my Letter. This is just what Archdeacon Eliot did, whose conclusion coincided exactly with mine. This is just what the Bishop of Oxford has done; and he also has come to the same conclusion. This is just what Dr Arnold and Mr Hull did in 1836; and their conclusion again was the same. So has it been with many more, some of whom have declared their opinion in print, many of whom have exprest it to me privately. Nor have I yet met with any one who has come forward with his name, differing from us, except Mr Trower. His complaint however of the Extracts is, that "they fail of conveying to the mind an adequate impression of the insidious and fatal character of Dr Hampden's teaching *as a whole*." This is

the safest ground for him to take: we know what *latet in generalibus*. *As a whole*, one may condemn any book, or any man. But this is not the manner in which Justice weighs guilt and innocence. Her scales are goldsmith's scales. She loves precision, definiteness, exactness, and cannot tolerate vagueness. She dwells in the serene sky, and abhors every mist. After the manner in which we have seen Mr Trower misunderstanding the plainest, simplest words, we may guess what he would make of a book, of which he had conceived an unfavorable impression, judging it *as a whole*.

As to the argument, that the discussions and tone of the Bampton Lectures are ill fitted for sermons before a mixt congregation, for my own part, I am not unwilling to assent to it. But it should not be allowed to bear with any peculiar force against Dr Hampden. For, though my acquaintance with the series of those Lectures is not extensive, I could name several, among others, those of the revered Bishop Heber, which in like manner treat on subjects of recondite theological erudition and subtilty. This too, I have fancied, was regarded as, to a certain extent, the special purpose of those Lectures; for which reason they are called Lectures, and not Sermons. This ought to be taken into account, when persons complain of the want of reverence in their tone. For the tone of theological disquisitions is necessarily different from that of homiletic discourses. It should be remembered too that a considerable change in this respect has taken place since the year 1832.

Mr Trower next proceeds to examine my examination of the Propositions. Here I cannot perceive that he has shaken the slightest of my arguments, or detected the minutest inaccuracy: if he had, I would gladly have acknowledged it. Still I feel it to be of such importance for

the peace of the Church, to make this matter as clear as possible, that, before I conclude, I will run over his objections.

The first two Propositions, he admits, are "capable of a *honesta interpretatio*. Dialectical science must be resorted to where accurate statements are required of some mysterious doctrine; and in the immediate context it is possible that Dr Hampden may mean no more than this." Why then not give him the benefit of this *honesta interpretatio*? Surely the charity, that *thinketh no evil*, would. Nay, even a court of human justice adopts the more merciful interpretation, when any words or act admit of more than one. This practice however has always been rejected by the *odium theologicum*, which magnifies and blackens every dubious speck, and whereby even amiable persons have often been grievously warpt. "Statements, (Mr Trower says,) which are capable of an innocent meaning, may become highly suspicious, when coupled with other statements of the same author:" and in proof of this he quotes a long passage forty pages off. Well then! at all events the indictment ought to be grounded on those other statements, and not on these, which, taken by themselves, may be, and are, perfectly innocent. At all events these two Propositions are to be thrown away as mere surplusage, stuft in to swell out the list of offenses. But let us look what there is so bad in this other passage, the poison of which is to infect what had been said forty pages before. "The Truth itself (Dr Hampden writes, p. 146) of the Trinitarian doctrine emerges from these mists of human speculation, like the bold, naked land, on which an atmosphere of fog has for a while rested, and then been disperst." No one can be more convinced than I am, that there is a real mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation, and that no

scheme of Unitarianism can solve the whole of the phenomena which Scripture records. But I am also as fully sensible that there is a mystery attacht to the subject, which is not a mystery of God." Here Mr Trower asks, "Where does Dr Hampden mean? In the Creeds and Articles of the Church? I really know no other meaning of this expression." Yet, if he had lookt at the very next sentence, he would have found a different one. This is another instance of that fixt notion, which, so to say, impales him, and will not let him go. He has made up his mind that Dr Hampden has set his heart on impugning the Creeds and Articles of the Church; and so he is convinced that this must needs be his covert meaning throughout, although he is unable to produce a single passage in which Dr Hampden does so openly, and though, as I have shewn, he has repeatedly declared his belief in those Creeds and Articles. In the present instance the passage which follows, and which Mr Trower cites, gives Dr Hampden's own explanation of his meaning. "Take for instance (he says), the notion of the Divine Unity. We are apt to conceive that the Unity must be understood numerically, that we may reason from the notion of Unity to the properties of the Divine Being. But is this a just notion of the Unity of God? Is it not rather a bare fact, a limit of speculation, instead of a point of outset?—When Moses called upon the people, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord Our God is one Lord*, was it not a declaration that Jehovah is not that host of Heaven,—that multiplicity of the objects of Divine worship, which heathen idolatry has enshrined, but the God in Heaven, and in the earth, and in the sea?—Surely the revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity, but *practically* to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought

out. It was no other than the command, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me.* Now were this view of the revelation of the Divine Unity strictly maintained, would it not greatly abate the repugnance often felt at the admission of a Trinity in Unity? We should profess that we only knew God as the exclusive object of Divine Worship, and should acknowledge that it is quite irrelevant to our scheme of religion, either to demonstrate or to refute any conclusion from the nature of Unity, concerning any further revelation of the Divine Being. To deny a Trinity would then be felt the same as to assert, that, because Polytheism is false, therefore no new manifestation of God, not resulting from the negation of Polytheism, can be true."

Now "in this most extraordinary passage, (Mr Trower says,) Dr Hampden declares that, when Moses solemnly taught the Children of Israel *the Lord our God is one Lord*, the Holy Ghost did not intend to communicate by his lips any revelation concerning the Supreme Being himself." Here we have the same vagueness and inexactness, which is so characteristic of Mr Trower. Dr Hampden says that this revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant "*to convey any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity.*" Mr Trower afterward acknowledges, in p. 57, that he does not "pretend to understand all the subtilties of scholastic speculations." This confession is candid, and thoroughly true: only it would have become him, under this consciousness, to refrain from discussions which cannot be carried on without a considerable understanding of such subtilties. When Dr Hampden's assertion, that the Scriptural declaration is not meant *to convey any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity*, is expanded into an assertion that it is not meant *to convey any revelation concerning the Supreme Being*, it is no wonder that all sorts of monsters may be started in every page.

Of course Mr Trower finds out that this passage cannot be reconciled with the Athanasian and other Creeds. But let any one look at the passage attentively and candidly; and what will he see to be its manifest purpose? Is it not to argue against the narrow dogmatism of the Unitarians, whose favorite topic is the incompatibility of the Divine Trinity with the Divine Unity? Every one who has the slightest knowledge of the history of Theology, must be aware how heresy after heresy has rung the changes on this argument: and Dr Hampden's object is plainly to maintain, that the Unity of God, as declared in the revelation to Moses, was not designed to be understood in that abstract speculative sense, in which it would have been contradictory to the subsequent revelation of the Trinity. It is a gross misconception of this passage, to fancy that it means to impugn, either the Unity of the Divine Being, or the Trinity, which, on the contrary, it expressly asserts.

Here we may perhaps discover the true view of that relation between the Bampton Lectures and BlancoWhite, out of which such a fable has been spun. As it is known from the Life of the latter, that he was greatly disturbed by doubts on this very point, for some time previous to the year when the Bampton Lectures were preacht, may we not plausibly conjecture that Dr Hampden, who is said to have been so intimate with him at the time, may have had him directly in his thoughts, when he wrote this passage? Is it not probable that the declaration of the Unity of God in the Old Testament may have been brought forward by Blanco White in conversation as an argument against the Trinity, and that this passage may have been intended as a reply to it, under the persuasion that other minds might have been disturbed thereby? One has only to look into Blanco White's Correspondence, to see how

this topic was brought forward, as altogether conclusive and unanswerable, by persons of all classes. Surely too it is honorable to Dr Hampden, if, while others were shunning their old friend, he endeavoured to convince him of his errour. Perhaps also this will supply us with the true explanation of that perplexing passage in the *Observations on Dissent*, where the author speaks of putting a Unitarian on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which he would place any other Christian. It may have been his regard for his friend, which led to the exaggerated expressions in this passage. We know too that Blanco White was truly animated by an earnest religious zeal, and by a fervent love for Christ, at the very time when his dogmatical speculations were leading him to doubt His Unity with the Father.

At all events these very words of the Law had already presented themselves to the Author's mind as a subject of consideration, in connexion with the doctrine of the Trinity, when he was writing his *Essay on the Evidence of Christianity:* see pp. 118, 158. In the latter of these two passages, he says: "If we consider in what manner we arrive at the Scriptural truth of a Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead,—we shall find that this doctrine is not dogmatically revealed to us in any express sentence, setting it forth to our belief in so many formal terms; but results rather, as a real truth of Revelation, from the concurrent evidence of a variety of passages, in which the Deity is represented as performing offices for the good of man under three *distinct* hypostases or persons. A doctrine establisht on a footing of this nature, it is important to observe, rests on the most immovable basis. For a single passage, or even several detacht passages, expressly asserting any particular doctrine, may be interpolated, may be

caviled at, may be explained away: but a truth, to the establishment of which the whole tenour of a volume conspires, cannot be overthrown, without the destruction of the sense of the whole volume." Verily, in the whole disgraceful history of religious persecutions, there is scarcely an instance of a charge maintained so pertinaciously, without the slightest real ground, and in defiance of abundant evidence to the contrary, as this against Dr Hampden for denying the true doctrine of the Trinity.

With regard to the third Proposition, which I thought I had sufficiently vindicated in p. 35, by quoting the context, Mr Trower says, he "does not see how this improves Dr Hampden's case. The devout tone, in which Augustin refers to the mysterious truths exprest by the words *Generatio* and *Processio*, is strikingly contrasted with the spirit in which Dr Hampden sneers at *theories coucht under a logical phraseology*, and *our technical language*; and (especially after what he has said about the oneness of the Deity) would any one receive the expression, *I believe that Word which has declared the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*, as if it were equivalent to the Catholic confession, *The Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God; and yet there are not three Gods but one God.* God forbid that I should impute to Dr Hampden personally any errour which he solemnly disclaims: but the above declaration of faith might be made by persons holding the greatest heresies." What can Mr Trower mean by deprecating the being guilty of such an imputation, when the purpose of the whole passage is to do the very thing which he deprecates? to impute to Dr Hampden the very errour which he has solemnly disclaimed? Else, what is the import of Mr Trower's words? When he called on God to forbid his doing so, he should forthwith have expunged the sentences, which directly

convey that imputation. Besides, since Dr Hampden quotes Augustin's words as expressive of his own belief, concluding his sermon with them, we should acknowledge that they do express it. As to the sneers, they exist nowhere, except in Mr Trower's imagination, to whom, from his habitual vagueness, the use of any precise terms seems to border on profaneness. That Dr Hampden's declaration of faith is not equivalent to the Catholic Confession, is quite true. But what reason had he for obtruding the latter in this place? A man who is conscious of being a firm believer, does not come forward in his sermon, and tell you that he is so. His very position in the pulpit implies it. Why then did he close his sermon with the above-cited declaration of faith? Because he had been speaking of the controversies concerning the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit; because he felt, with Augustin, that, though these words may be necessary as a bar to heretical speculation, they can only most dimly shadow forth the mysterious relations of the Divine Persons; and because he deemed that, it would have been better, had it been possible, for theology to confine itself to the simple Scriptural expressions, which tell us of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Here I will insert another passage from the author's *Essay on the Evidence of Christianity* (p. 293), which may help to elucidate what has been so much misunderstood in the processes of his reasoning, and which at all events fully proves that the Bampton Lectures are the genuine work of the same mind. "The philosophy which the labourers in the field of human science pursue, is an investigation of ultimate principles. They endeavour, not only to trace connecting principles among the events of nature, but to simplify to the utmost the discerned connexions between physical events. But in Divine philosophy we must repress

this endeavour after simplification. We must be content to hold all the truths which are the subjects of it, as ultimate principles. For we know nothing of them beyond themselves, as a collection of attested facts, presented simultaneously to our contemplation. We have no knowledge of them as antecedents and consequences, as we have of the facts of Nature; and therefore, as our only mode of judging of the existence of necessary connexion fails us in regard to them, we have no reason to suppose that any one truth of Scripture is the grand antecedent of the rest, or the master-principle by which the whole congeries of Scripture truths may be combined. Indeed the absurdity of attempting so to combine them is demonstrated by the erroneous views of Christian doctrine, to which every such attempt invariably leads. For instance, if we assume the Divine predestination, as the great principle of our theological system, we expose ourselves to the absurdity of denying that God has bestowed the gift of a perfect free-will on man; and we destroy the moral force of God's promises set forth in Scripture, and the efficacy of prayer; and in short we disparage the whole revelation of Christianity by subordinating it to an abstruse metaphysical tenet. If we assume the Divine benevolence as our principle, we perplex ourselves with difficulties concerning the punishments actually inflicted on men in this world, or threatened in Scripture. If again we assume the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit, as the principle, we impugn that law of Providence, which assigns reward and punishment to every man according to his works, and weaken the ascription of our salvation to the atoning efficacy of the Redeemer's blood. If lastly we assume as our ultimate principle, to which every other doctrine must bend, the doctrine of justification by the merits of Christ, we incur the danger of Antinomianism, and we impair, in our exclusive zeal

for the honour of God the Son, the integrity of the doctrine of the Trinity, overlooking the equal importance of the relations which we bear also to God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost. These instances may well convince us that, however to superior intelligences the aggregate of religious doctrines may appear true, from their agreement with some one ultimate principle equally pervading them all, we can only know them as individual Facts, connected with each other in one scheme, or as instances, for the most part, of different principles of Divine Providence, which it belongs not to us to reconcile with each other, whilst they must be held by us in perfect concord.—The Articles of the Church of England not consisting so much of affirmations of Scripture truth, as of negations of doctrines unscripturally introduced into the body of the Faith, it is evident that their whole drift is to maintain the exclusive authority of Scripture, and not to limit it by selection. Upon the same principle of excluding heretical opinions as they arose, may be accounted for the greater length of the two later Creeds, compared with that called the Apostles Creed. And though, in the Athanasian, it is said concerning the believer, that 'before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith,' which faith it explains to consist in a right notion of the Trinity, we ought not to suppose that it states one doctrine as necessary above all others, but that the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, when disencumbered of its unscriptural additions, as including all others, or as a comprehensive expression of all Scripture truth, is necessarily confest in the true confession of Christianity." This passage, as I have before stated, was publisht in 1827, and proves how truly the author said in his Inaugural Lecture that he had made the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity the groundwork of his teaching throughout. It also refutes the calumny in the

last number of *the Christian Remembrancer*, where a writer charges Dr Hampden with "attempting, in the Preface to the second edition of the Lectures, to evade the force of his own words, and explain the word *fact* in such a manner as, by including doctrines, to nullify and stultify the whole discussion of the Bampton Lectures at a blow. We will not characterize (he adds) the candour and honesty of such a proceeding." Its candour and honesty however are thoroughly establisht by the use of the word *facts* in this passage printed five years before, and by other similar expressions in the same volume. The candour and honesty of the accusation, it may be less easy to vindicate.

After what has been said, I need not stop to reply to Mr Trower's remarks on the sixth Proposition, which he acknowledges to be untrue, but does not think an unfair representation of the animus of the whole passage. The word is a characteristic one. The meaning of a sentence is what the author puts into it; the *animus*, whatever the reader's jealous suspicions may like to detect.

In speaking of the seventh Proposition he expresses his "deep regret that a person in my station" should call Dr Hampden's remark about the origin of the term, of '*one substance with the Father*,' "innocent enough." Yet, as the remark merely states an etymological fact, I still cannot see what there is to blame in it. "The language of the Nicene Creed (Mr Trower says,) was settled by the blessing of Almighty God on the Councils of his Church." Still the Fathers who assembled at Nicea, had been educated in the philosophy of their age, and spoke its language. They were not charged with the invention of a new system of philosophy, still less of a new language. If their language was defective, it was the only instrument they had for expressing the truth; and so they made use of it.

Of the Propositions relating to the Atonement, Mr

Trower admits that one "is not fairly made;" but he tries to apologize for them all, as not materially misrepresenting the author's meaning. He further gives us his own view of the mystery of the Atonement, and thinks that Dr Hampden, in the passage quoted in pp. 46, 47, which he rebukes me for calling excellent, has represented the adaptation of this mysterious act to the wants of human nature as "the real end of this stupendous fact." Here however he again shews his inability to go along with the processes of reasoning pursued in the Bampton Lectures. According to the whole tenour of his theology, the Author entirely refrains from pronouncing what is the real end of the Atonement, when considered in its Divine relations. This is just what a disciple of Butler would do, and coincides with what Butler himself says in *the Analogy* on the subject (P. II. c. v.). "How and in what particular way the sacrifice of Christ had this efficacy, there are not wanting persons who have endeavoured to explain: but I do not find that the Scripture has explained it. We seem to be very much in the dark concerning the manner in which the ancients understood atonement to be made, *i. e.* pardon to be obtained by sacrifices. And if the Scripture has, as surely it has, left this matter of the satisfaction of Christ mysterious, left somewhat in it unrevealed, all conjectures about it must be, if not evidently absurd, yet at least uncertain.—Not only the reason of the thing, but the whole analogy of nature, teaches us not to expect to have the like information concerning the Divine conduct, as concerning our own duty.—The doctrine of a Mediator between God and man, against which it is objected, that the expediency of some things in it is not understood, relates only to what was done on God's part in the appointment, and on the Mediator's in the execution of it. For what is required of us, in consequence of this gracious dispensation,

is another subject, in which none can complain for want of information." Every attentive reader, I think, must perceive how closely these views coincide with Dr Hampden's, which in fact are avowedly derived from Butler, both on this and on other great theological questions. At the same time, like a disciple of Butler, he shews how the universal voice of human nature proclaims the need of some such Divine act; and this act, which fulfills all our needs in a manner far beyond our utmost conception and comprehension, he says, we find in the Atonement; adding that the purpose for which this act has been declared to us, is not, that we should enter into speculations, as theologians have been so fond of doing, concerning the relation of the Divine attributes to each other, but that, according to the teaching of St Paul, we may know that we have past from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, through Him who is our Atonement. Against speculations concerning the Divine act, contemplated in itself, he cannot, consistently with the whole bent of his theology, do otherwise than warn us. Nor is the warning needless. For monstrous and blasphemous errours have sprung out of such speculations, when rashly pursued by persons picking out a few texts, and building systems upon them, from the time of Marcion downward: and we need the utmost caution, lest, in speaking of the manner in which we conceive the purpose of God to have been changed, and His wrath to have been appeased, by the sacrifice of Christ, we lose sight, as so many have done, of those still more express and explicit declarations of Scripture, that with *the Father there is no variableness or shadow of turning;* and that *God so loved the world, that He gave His Only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life;* that *God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died*

for us; that *in this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His Onlybegotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him;* that *herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the Propitiation for our sins.* How continually are these latter most blessed truths veiled from our view in sermons on the Passion, in which the sacrifice of the Saviour is often represented as exclusively the act of the Son, offered up to satisfy the Justice of the Father, which must otherwise have condemned all mankind to eternal perdition! Yet such a representation, if we take the whole sum of the declarations in the Bible, is altogether unscriptural. But it enables us to set forth the Divine truth in the form of propositions deduced from certain human analogies, which are more easily comprehensible to the understanding, and more gratifying to its pride, than when the truth is left in that mysterious, ineffable glory, which surrounds it in its emanation from the bosom of the Godhead.

For the tenth extract, which I have called "perfidious," and which, I had thought, must have shockt every one on seeing how it perverted the Author's meaning, Mr Trower tries to stand up. He says that what Dr Hampden terms the philosophy of expiation, "includes that view of our blessed Saviour's sacrifice, which led the framers of our Articles to speak of it thus: The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone." He further argues that Dr Hampden intends to imply that we ought "to qualify the plain meaning of that Article by reminding ourselves that the word *satisfaction* was used in the subtile reasonings and speculations of the schools, and that, as applied to our Saviour's sacrifice,

it belongs to a philosophy of expiation, which he is not afraid to speak of as baneful." Now at all events, if Dr Hampden did mean to say anything like this, I know not by what magical process such a meaning can be extracted from the words of the Proposition,—"The bane of this philosophy of expiation was that it deprest the power of man too low." Mr Trower's transmuting glance may find that meaning in these words: I cannot. It is true, what Dr Hampden calls *the philosophy of expiation*, embraces a special view of the sacrifice of Christ: but what he means by it is that systematic representation of the relation between God and man, founded on the notions of commutative justice, which was workt out in the practice of the Church of Rome, and in the theological treatises of the Schoolmen, into such elaborate details; wherein the one sole Sacrifice for sin was almost lost sight of, amid the numberless ritual forms and human acts of satisfaction and penance and mortification. *The philosophy of expiation* is, not the view of the Divine act by itself, but the mischievous, deadly system constructed upon it. This is plain and unquestionable from the words which follow, and which I have quoted in p. 50. The bane of this philosophy of expiation, the author says, was, not that it exalted human agency too highly,—as might have been supposed from its ascribing the power of working out his own salvation by means of such acts to man;—but that, on the contrary, it deprest the power of man too low, that "it did not carry him at once to the Throne of Grace," but degraded him into a servile dependence on the ministrations of the priest. Thus the purpose of the passage is to assert the very truth proclaimed in our thirty-first Article, which Mr Trower supposes it to impugn, that "the offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world both original

and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone."

The last passage from the Bampton Lectures, which Mr Trower quotes and condemns, is a long one concerning the Sacraments. Of this I said before (p. 51), and I repeat now with the fullest deliberation and confidence, that it treats of the medieval doctrine. Mr Trower indeed asks (p. 53), "How can Archdeacon Hare say that this is the medieval doctrine, when Dr Hampden has just before referred to the Catechism of the Church of England as retaining the fundamental idea of the scholastic doctrine?" In reply I would ask Mr Trower, or any other man with a single grain of intelligence, How he can read the seventh Lecture, without seeing that, from beginning to end, it treats of the Scholastic doctrine; referring indeed here and there, on the one hand, to the Scriptural truths which that doctrine laid hold of and developt, and to the Scriptural expressions in which it sought support; and, on the other hand, to the traces of that doctrine still retained in our technical phraseology. He might just as rationally assert that Niebuhr, or Arnold, did not write a history of Rome, because there are many allusions in their works to events and institutions belonging to the history of modern Europe. If he had lookt at the foot of the page, he would have seen that, what the Author meant by "the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine," was that exprest in the definition of a sacrament, which we have retained, as *invisibilis gratiae visibile signum;* words which admit, but do not necessitate, a material interpretation, and which, the author adds, "our Church has modified and improved in her subsequent application of the definition," thereby limiting its ambiguity and determining it in a spiritual sense.

In fact this is the object of the Bampton Lectures

throughout, as the Author expressly states at the outset, and in the original Preface. Yet his adversaries, either from reading the book cursorily, for the purpose of finding stumbling-blocks in it, or from an incapacity for discerning minute scholastic distinctions, and following speculative trains of thought, have been unable or unwilling to apprehend this: and this is the main ground of their misconceptions. That a work of the kind should be thus misunderstood, when both philosophy and theology were at such a miserably low ebb, as they have been during the last generations in England, and when the theological education of our Clergy has been next to nothing, is not much to be wondered at; more especially as the writer himself has not cultivated that clearness and distinctness of language, which under such circumstances were especially needful. But that his objections do not touch the real efficacy of the Sacraments, as recognised by our Church, that they merely refer to the systematic theory of their mode of operation, which was elaborated into such minute details by the Schoolmen, and which became one of the most effectual instruments whereby the Church of Rome maintained her usurpations, and held the spirit of man in servile subjection, is evident, even from parts of the passage which Mr Trower transcribes. "Theologians (Dr Hampden there says) have not been content to rest on the simple fact of the Divine Ordinance, appointing certain external rites as essential parts of Divine service on the part of man, available to the blessing of the receiver. But they have treated the Sacraments *as effusions of the virtue of Christ, physically quickening and strengthening the soul,* in a manner analogous to the invigoration of the body by salutary medicines." The last expressions Mr Trower considers at variance with that passage in our Catechism, where our souls are said to be "strengthened and refresht by the body and

blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." This is an example of the confusion, through which the readers of the Bampton Lectures have so often been led to suspect evil, where there was none. The expressions in our Catechism are indeed derived from that theoretical view, the erroneousness of which Dr Hampden endeavours to expose. But in our Catechism these expressions are merely intended as a figurative illustration of a spiritual act. In the theological systems, which he is combating, these expressions, like so many others of the same kind, which are used in Scripture as mere human illustrations of Divine mysteries,—κατ' ἄνθρωπον, as St Paul says,—from the necessities of human thought and speech, were treated as physical or logical explanations of those mysteries, and were woven into a speculative theory, to which neither the writers of Scripture, nor the framers of our symbolical books had any intentional reference. The errour was the very same as that of which, in its application to Physical Science, Dr Whewell gives such a clear exposition in the section on the Aristotelian Physics in his *History of the Inductive Sciences.* Now, to recur to an instance already cited, a person who pointed out that the words, *jovial, mercurial, saturnine,* are derived from the astrology of the middle ages, would not intend thereby to tax those who may use these words with holding the errours of judicial astrology; nor is any censure of the kind implied, when it is remarkt that certain theological terms have originated in erroneous philosophical views. Even words may lose the evil taint of their birth; and Horne Tooke's perverse notion, that the derivative senses of abstract terms must always be identified with their etymological meaning, has hardly found a follower. Some signs indeed are types; but in the great body of our current language the typical stamp is wholly worn away. If we keep these distinctions

in mind, we shall see that Dr Hampden throughout does not mean to controvert, but to assert and vindicate the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacraments, as held by our Church; and accordingly he closes his seventh Lecture by appropriating the beautiful words of Hooker. "He who has said of the one Sacrament, *Wash and be clean*, hath said concerning the other, *Eat and live*. If therefore, without any such particular and solemn warrant as this is, that poor distrest woman, coming to Christ for health, could so constantly resolve herself; *May I but touch the skirt of His garment, I shall be whole;* what moveth us to argue of the manner how life should come by bread? our duty being here, but to take what is offered, and most assuredly to rest persuaded of this, that, can we but eat, we are safe. What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not: it is enough that, to me who take them, they are the body and blood of Christ. His promise in witness thereof sufficeth: His word He knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant, but this, *O my God, thou art true! O my soul, thou art happy!*"

In this and other speculations Dr Hampden may be mistaken. His views on divers philosophical, or even theological questions, may be erroneous. Let not Mr Trower catch at this as an "admission" that they are so: I am merely speaking hypothetically. Granting however that they are, is this to exclude him from the Episcopate? Clearly not; unless the errours are plainly contrary to the faith in Christ, as specifically defined by the Articles of our Church, for the direction of her Ministers. Surely we do not demand that every Bishop who is placed on the Bench should be infallible; nay, that he should never have committed an errour in the whole course of his theological enquiries. Even conceding, what I merely

concede for the sake of argument, that there is grave theological errour in the Bampton Lectures, where can we find a divine in whom there is none such? a divine who has not brought forward some particular portions of the Truth, to the omission or disparagement of others? May we not find grave errours, either positive, or no less important ones, from defective statements of the Truth, in Butler, in Bull, in Jeremy Taylor, in Hammond, in Andrewes, even in Leighton and Hooker,—in all the divines, as Mr Trower will probably be very ready to allow, of the forein Protestant Churches,—in all the Romish divines,—in all those of the middle ages,—in all the Fathers,—in Chrysostom, in Basil, in the Gregories, in Jerome, even in Augustin. But what does this amount to? except to what even the heathens acknowledged, that *humanum est errare*, and what Christians assuredly have never been taught to deny; in other words, that no perfect declaration of the Truth is to be found anywhere except in the inspired word of God. Not that this confession should lessen our love and admiration for the great teachers of the Church, save by keeping it from degenerating into idolatry. They themselves would have been the first to recognise, and even to magnify their infirmities; and in this very recognition lay the main source of their strength. They were, and are still, pillars of the Church, though no one pillar can support the whole roof. They were teachers of the Truth, though not of the whole Truth, and not without alloy. Still too we may learn from them, as thousands and thousands have already: only in reading them we are to remember St Paul's injunction, to *prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.* For we are not made to receive knowledge, as water is poured into a cup, but to assimilate it, as a plant does its elemental food, separating and digesting

that which is nourishing, and rejecting what is otherwise. Hence, as no one is mad enough to dream that we can have an infallible bench of Bishops, we have no right to demand an immunity from errour in any new candidate for the Episcopate. Nor have we any right to narrow the bounds of theological speculation within the limits already prescribed to it by the laws of our Church. A Council of our Church might have such a legal right; but woe worth the day when a Council attempted to exercise it! At all events, until that day comes, let us freely and thankfully enjoy and use the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. It is ours; and we are bound in duty to maintain it, and to suffer no man to curtail it.

In concluding his Remarks, Mr Trower says: "I fear that, instead of clearing Dr Hampden from the charge of heretical teaching, the Archdeacon will only strengthen the misgiving which exists among many as to the soundness of his own opinions, and the safety of his guidance in Theology." Of course, when I took up my pen, I had counted the cost, and well knew that the railers, who had nothing else to say, and would be enraged that a victim should be wrested from their grasp, would give vent to their rage by trying to fix their claws in another. I knew what an offense it is in the eyes of the Inquisition, and of all who are animated by its spirit, to urge anything in excuse of those whom they are about to consign to the stake. But I did not expect to find an amiable and good man, like Mr Trower, coming forward as their spokesman. "The time (he says) is come when men's real principles are tried:" and so it is. All times indeed are times of trial to our frail nature; but some may be so more especially, at least in certain respects. And this is a time when it is tried, whether men will cleave to truth and justice, unflinchingly, unswervingly, with singleness of

heart, at whatsoever cost, or whether they will surrender themselves to be the slaves and creatures and blind tools of a party. It is a time when we are to be tried, whether we will strive with unsleeping watchfulness against the prejudices of our understandings and the delusive predilections of our hearts, whether we can be candid in spite of ourselves, and can give impartial judgement in behalf of our enemies, whether we will eschew and abhor all manner of falsehood, or admit it into our arms, and let it suck our heart's blood, and poison all our affections. Doubtless a disputant might rejoin, that a misgiving exists as to the soundness of Mr Trower's own opinions. For who is there in these days, earnestly holding any determinate opinions of whatsoever kind, whose soundness is not distrusted by one party or another? Misgivings, suspicions, jealousies, backbitings, cavils, quarrels, calumnies have almost become the ordinary diet of our Church. I regret that a person like Mr Trower should have allowed himself to throw out such an insinuation, that he should not have felt the sinfulness of doing so. Having just been urging that no divine, not even the greatest, is exempt from errour, I ought to be the last person to claim such an exemption for myself. I have desired indeed, and endeavoured, that my writings should be free from errours; but doubtless there are many in them, some, it may be, indicating unsoundness of doctrine. As I have spoken too with condemnation of the errours of others, when it has seemed to me requisite for the wellbeing of the Church that fallacies, by which some might be misled, should be exposed and reproved, I cannot expect that my own should pass unreproved. Still less do I desire it. Let Mr Trower bring them forward definitely and distinctly; let him condemn them as severely as they may deserve;

and if he convinces me of their erroneousness, he shall rank thenceforward among my chief benefactors. For surely a minister of Christ ought not to be less sincere in his love for truth, than the heathen philosopher, who says so beautifully in the Gorgias, that he is one *τῶν ἡδέως μὲν ἂν ἐλεγχθέντων, εἴ τι μὴ ἀληθὲς λέγω, ἡδέως δ' ἂν ἐλεγξάντων, εἴ τίς τι μὴ ἀληθὲς λέγοι, οὐκ ἀηδέστερον μέν τ' ἂν ἐλεγχθέντων ἢ ἐλεγξάντων· μεῖζον γὰρ αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν ἡγοῦμαι, ὅσῳ περ μεῖζον ἀγαθόν ἐστιν αὐτὸν ἀπαλλαγῆναι κακοῦ τοῦ μεγίστου ἢ ἄλλον ἀπαλλάξαι. οὐδὲν γὰρ οἶμαι τοσοῦτον κακὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπῳ, ὅσον δόξα ψευδὴς περὶ ὧν τυγχάνει νῦν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ὤν.* At the same time I would exhort Mr Trower, if he desires not to be found wanting in this time of trial, to refrain most sedulously from everything like a vague, indefinite insinuation against a brother. It is like inflicting a wound in the dark, or behind one's back, when one cannot meet or parry it. Against a definite charge one may defend oneself; or, if it be wellgrounded, it may be a help to self-knowledge and correction. But an insinuation is purely mischievous, to him against whom it is brought, to all who allow their confidence in a brother to be disturbed by it, and above all to him who brings it. As to being an unsafe guide, I desire not to be a guide to any one, beyond those who are especially committed to my charge, except by helping him to guide himself, by helping him, if I may, to love the truth, and to seek it for himself, through a diligent and faithful exercise of the faculties with which God has supplied him, and at the sources which God has opened to him. When one wishes to deliver others from servile submission to any earthly authority, it would be a flagrant inconsistency to set up oneself as a guide. If St Paul said, *Who is Paul? and who is Apollos?* what does it behove

us to say, but that we are nothing, except instruments in God's hands, whom He employs in the work of His Gospel, according as it seems good to Him?

In a Postscript to his Remarks, Mr Trower finds fault with the Bishop of Oxford for withdrawing the suit against Dr Hampden in the Court of Arches. On this question I am not called to enter. But since Mr Trower (in p. 64), "begs my especial attention" to certain distinctions, which he taxes his ingenuity to establish between the Bishop of Oxford's sentence and mine, I cannot conclude without observing that, in spite of these distinctions, his judgement is essentially the same. To make out these discrepancies Mr Trower urges that, "notwithstanding my admissions, I have pronounced the completest, most honorable acquittal;" leaving out of sight, according to his wont, that, in saying this, I spoke (p. 60) "so far as regards the heresies imputed to Dr Hampden, and supposing that the Propositions are the strongest evidence that can be adduced." On the other hand it is true that the Bishop of Oxford lays a good deal of stress on certain concessions, which he conceives Dr Hampden to have made, which, however, if we sift them, we plainly see, amount to nothing. Sitting in some measure as a judge on the question, he expresses himself judicially, with divers limitations. Still he declares the Bampton Lectures to be pretty nearly what I have throughout described them, "a thoughtful and able history of the formation of dogmatic terminology, not a studied depreciation of authorized dogmatic language, still less any conscious denial of admitted dogmatic truth." If he complains of an overstatement of favorite views, I had used nearly the same words. If he ascribes the misjudgement of the work to "obscurity of diction," and similar defects, it is to be remembered that he had to apologize, not only for his own misjudgement, under the influence of which he

had so long acted, but for that of many of his friends; while, as I had not been mixt up in the previous controversy, I had nothing to retract, and perhaps, from a longer familiarity with the obscurities of language and the tangled reasonings, which are so common in philosophical and theological treatises, was not equally disturbed by them. A reader of Nitzsch and Daub, of Kant and Hegel, will not be so easily offended by the obscurities of Dr Hampden, but will try to pierce through them for the sake of getting to his real meaning.

Here at length I may take leave of Mr Trower. To some readers it may seem that I have spent far too many words on a Pamphlet, which, unless I have grossly misrepresented it, cannot be of much real weight. But, as a drowning man will catch at a straw, so there are some among Dr Hampden's adversaries, who, seeing their cause slipping away from under their feet, will even catch at such arguments as those here adduced. In the present state of feeling too, if any objections are left unnoticed as undeserving of a serious refutation, it is assumed that they are admitted, as I have already experienced in this case. For, after having exposed the fallaciousness of four or five-and-thirty out of the forty-two Propositions, I past over the remainder, partly from weariness at the painful task, and partly from thinking that every intelligent reader would perceive how the explanations of the other passages objected to would apply to the rest. Nevertheless some persons have thought fit to ensconce themselves behind these. This, though I have not thought it necessary to return and dislodge them, has rendered me fuller and more minute than I should else have been in replying to Mr Trower. Nor shall I deem my words wasted, if they can avail to clear up any doubts in a single mind among the thousands that have been disturbed by this

calamitous agitation. The enemy, we have already seen, is on the alert, and will try, secretly and openly, to take advantage of this occasion for drawing weak and wavering minds from their allegiance to our Church. This from the first was one of my chief reasons for deploring Dr Hampden's appointment. The Minister tells us that his intention was to strengthen the Protestant cause in our Church; but I am afraid, hardly any measure he could have adopted, would have tended so greatly to strengthen our opponents. Our endeavours ought to be to confirm the waverers, those who are weak in the faith, and not to involve them in doubtful disputations: but the effect of this appointment is to repell them, and to entangle them in manifold perplexities. With a view to such persons more especially have I written in this Postscript, from a strong desire to help, if I may, in dispelling the delusions by which so many minds have been irritated and troubled, and to convince them that our beloved Church is not undergoing the oppression and disgrace, as her enemies are ready to cry out, of having a heretical Bishop forced upon her by an arbitrary exercise of the civil supremacy, but that the new Bishop has been greatly misrepresented and calumniated, and holds, and, so far as we have means of judging, has ever held and taught the true Christian faith, as defined by the Creeds and Articles of our Church.

On the many difficult and distressing ecclesiastical questions which have arisen out of this controversy, I abstain from speaking. It would require far more knowledge than I possess, to speak on them to any purpose. Let us wait quietly for the decision of the Law. Should that be injurious to the Church, let us seek to have the law amended in a constitutional manner. Our strength, now as ever, lies in patience, not in clamour or turbulence. Let us stand at our post, and not quit it. Let us close our ears

against all allurements to desert it. Let us look with confidence to God, and also with confidence, not with jealous suspicions, to those whom He has set over us. Even as a matter of policy, confidence is strength, and will conciliate the powers that be, while jealousy and suspicion must needs alienate them. And the Epistle for the week teaches us how that which is the course of policy, is also the course of duty.

February 2d, 1848.

Since writing the above, I have seen *the Christian Observer* for the month of January; and, having stated that almost every one I know of who has taken the pains to examine Dr Hampden's writings fairly and attentively, has been led to form a favorable judgement on the question of his orthodoxy, I feel bound to mention that the writer of the remarks upon him in that Journal, though evidently desirous to do him justice, and reluctant to condemn him, "regrets" that he cannot pronounce the charges of heterodoxy groundless. I would fain hope that the impartial writer of those observations, should he read the foregoing explanations of Dr Hampden's opinions, will find many of his objections removed: and if he will look over the last two chapters of *the Analogy*, he will see that several of the views which have been deemed so offensive in the Bampton Lectures, are merely expansions of what had been said long ago by Butler. Thus, in the seventh chapter, in a passage which Dr Hampden, in a note to his *Inaugural Lecture*, says first suggested to him the use of the term *fact*, Butler writes: "This Revelation, whether real or supposed, may be considered as wholly historical. For prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass: *doctrines also are matters of fact:* and precepts come under the same notion. And the general design of Scripture, which contains in it this Revelation, thus considered as historical, may be said to be to give us an account of the world, in this one

single view, as God's world." These words seem to contain the origin of the passage in the *Observations on Dissent*, quoted above (pp. 41, 42), and which the Christian Observer also quotes and finds fault with. Again, in the eighth chapter, Butler says: "Now, these two abstract principles of liberty and moral fitness being omitted, *religion can be considered in no other view than merely as a question of fact;* and in this view it is here considered. It is obvious that Christianity, and the proof of it, are both historical. And *even Natural Religion is properly a matter of fact. For that there is a righteous Governor of the world, is so.* —So likewise, that there is, in the nature of things, an original standard of right and wrong in actions, independent upon all will, but which unalterably determines the will of God to exercise that moral government over the world which religion teaches, *i. e.* finally and upon the whole to reward and punish men respectively as they act right or wrong,—*this assertion contains an abstract truth, as well as matter of fact.* But suppose in the present state every man was rewarded and punisht in exact proportion as he followed or transgrest that sense of right and wrong which God has implanted in the nature of every man, *this would not be at all an abstract truth, but only a matter of fact.*—And thus God having given mankind a moral faculty, the object of which is actions, and which naturally approves some actions as right and condemns others as wrong, that He will finally, and upon the whole, reward the former and punish the latter, *is not an assertion of an abstract truth, but of what is as mere a fact as His doing so at present would be.*" If the Christian Observer will weigh these passages, along with what has been said above in pp. 13—15, he must, I think, see the injustice of charging Dr Hampden with "*slipping* in the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father and the Holy Spirit among his *revealed facts*," as though he had done this dishonestly. The words which I have quoted in p. 14, from the Bampton Lectures, prove that this must already have been in the Author's mind; and according to his phraseology our Lord's declaration, *I and the Father are one*, is the declaration of a Divine Fact. As controversy leads one to bring out the controverted points more distinctly, even before one's own mind, the Author's conception of the term *Fact* became more definite when

he wrote his Introduction to the second edition : but this does not warrant a charge of inconsistency, still less of the moral obliquity imputed to him by *the Christian Remembrancer,* even though he may be found to have used the word at times in a sense answering to its ordinary acceptation. This is a danger to which an innovator in the use of words must needs be liable.

With regard to the validity of consequences drawn by way of inference from truths explicitly declared in Scripture, which validity Dr Hampden is supposed by most of his opponents altogether to deny, I would request the attention of the Christian Observer to the sixth Section of the above-mentioned Introduction, where this question is ably discust ; for instance, to the following words : "It would be perfectly illogical and absurd for any one to deny consequences rightly drawn from admitted premises. If, for instance, Scripture shews, as it does, that our Saviour is truly God, as well as truly Man, the consequence is irrefragable that He united Two Natures in One Person.—A consequence of this kind is nothing more than what has been already affirmed in Scripture. We have done nothing more than collect or put together the affirmations of Scripture. Though we may not therefore read this conclusion *totidem verbis* in Scripture, it is as much in Scripture as if it had been read there *totidem verbis.* Whatever then can be thus argued from Scripture is as true as Scripture is true. In this way things spiritual are compared with spiritual ; and a consistent sense is drawn out by just reasoning on the comparison." This passage, with the rest of the Section, where the necessary restrictions to these logical processes are set forth, is a complete answer to the main part of the objections urged by the Christian Observer.

London: Printed by S. Bentley & Co. Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

ARCHDEACON HARE'S

LETTER TO THE

EDITOR OF THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

TO

THE EDITOR OF THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

Sir,

In the last number of your Review, you have inserted an article entitled, *On Tendencies towards the Subversion of Faith*. There are many such tendencies in these days, and very mischievous ones, proceeding from divers quarters, not seldom from those who deem themselves the sole champions of the Faith. Nor can there be any subject of deeper interest to the Church, or calling for more Christian wisdom to consider it. I was somewhat puzzled however at seeing that, among the six works enumerated at the head of the article, two bore my name, one as Editor, the Collection of Sterling's Essays,—the other, *the Mission of the Comforter*. Of the former I shall speak anon. But what could the latter, I askt myself, have to do with tendencies subversive of Faith? How could it be dragged under such a category? On reading the article I found that I had been selected by the writer, as the chief offender. At least I am the main object of his reprobation, and not unmeritedly so, if there are any grounds whatever for it. But what is the fact? I have little relish for the practice of answering literary criticisms. Let the critic confine himself to his proper field, however unfair and abusive he may be, the most judicious course

to gratify their appetites by tearing and mangling the remains of my friend. Besides I could not but foresee the likelihood that I myself should incur blame, and might give offense to many pious persons, which my office rendered it a special obligation to avoid. Why then did I undertake the work? For a long time I shrank from it, until at length it seemed that the power of choice was scarcely left to me. For the alternative presented to me was, that I should execute the work, or else that it would be executed by another. Now I felt a deep conviction that, if such a monument was to be erected to Sterling, I was the person whom he would have wisht to erect it; and this conviction was shared by most of his friends, if not by all. Nor was any other qualified to speak of the most interesting, most energetic, happiest, and best period of his life, that which he spent in the active labours of the ministry. Nor was there any one who knew so much of his subsequent perplexities, or had such means of tracing their progress. Had the picture of his ministerial life been left out, the whole would have been sadly distorted, and would have assumed a much greater similarity to that of Blanco White, with which the Reviewer compares it. Under these convictions, and in the belief that the work, if executed by me, would do more justice to my friend, and be more profitable to others, than if it came from any other pen, I determined to encounter the obloquy which it might bring on me; although my reluctance to defy that was aggravated by the fear that some might be cast upon my friend, with the view of injuring me. For divers causes had compelled me to take part in some of our ecclesiastical and religious controversies, whereby I must almost inevitably have displeased the vehement partisans, it might even be, of

both the opposite parties; and I knew how unscrupulous many of the writers in our Religious Journals are, if they can but wound an adversary. I knew that the *odium theologicum* has not forfeited its ancient character. This probability seemed increast, when it so happened that the publication of the work took place in the midst of the painful disputes on the appointment of the Bishop of Hereford; so that I was quite thankful when I saw an article in *the Guardian*, written during the heat of that controversy, in the gentlemanly spirit which mostly distinguishes that newspaper, speaking kindly of Sterling, and even of his Biographer. The evil day however was only postponed. That from which *the Guardian* was withheld by its gentlemanly spirit, has now been done by the writer in your Review.

One of his main charges against me, which he repeats again and again, is, that I have held up Sterling to admiration. Having undertaken to write his life, how could I do otherwise than exhibit the beautiful and noble features of his character? Its nobleness shines through his letters, and has been felt by numbers who have read them. It was felt in like manner by all who came near him while he was on earth, in proportion to their knowledge of him. Was I then to suppress it, or to veil it over? Is this your Reviewer's conception of the duty of a biographer? Often, alas! there have been those who have deemed that to speak the truth is a tendency subversive of faith, that the God of Truth is to be worshipt and defended by lies; and this article proves that the race of such persons is not extinct. In this spirit the writer of it tries to make his readers believe that I have held up Sterling's errours to admiration. He does not expressly assert this: he just keeps

clear of the downright falsehood: but he insinuates it repeatedly, in the shuffling manner which characterizes the whole article, complaining of my eulogizing a sceptic and an infidel, while he omits all mention of my having said anything shewing how I deplored and mourned over his errours, while I tried to explain their origin and progress. To me it seemed that such a course would be far more profitable to persons in a like state of mind, than if I had denounced and railed at them. Many will be softened and won by sympathy, and by an earnest attempt to enter into their difficulties, who would only be repelled and irritated by a summary condemnation, the injustice and harshness of which they would deeply feel and resent. I am well aware that a practice very different from this has in all ages been adopted by the bravoes of Orthodoxy, one of whose favorite employments has ever been to traduce and blacken the character of all such as, on whatsoever grounds, had incurred the imputation of heresy. Afraid of meeting their adversaries in honorable battle, they have shot at them with poisoned arrows. I am aware too that many good men have betrayed the weakness of their faith, and the slipperiness of their honesty, by their readiness in giving ear to and propagating the grossest calumnies with such a purpose. But surely their conduct is a most powerful warning to seek truth and pursue it with singleness of aim, in the smallest things as well as in the greatest. The course which I have taken seemed to me moreover to be that set before us in the example of Him, who had compassion on our infirmities, and came to bear our sins in this way also, and who did not refuse to be called the Friend of publicans and sinners. In the Reviewer's copy of the New Testament, one might suppose, all this

portion must be left out: for he has no more notion of such a duty than if he had lived in the ages anterior to the Gospel. He sneers at me more than once (pp. 402, 439) by means of his favorite flower of speech, italics, for having spoken of the deep sympathy with the errours and faults, and even with the sins of mankind, manifested in Sterling's early writings, as a peculiar excellence, which is also found in some others among the great writers of our age. To those who have ever thought of comparing the manner in which the lower orders, their vices, their sins, their temptations, their errours, are spoken of now, with the tone adopted toward them in former centuries, the contrast must be very striking: and though this spirit may be perverted, as every good spirit may be, and may be turned into maudlin sentimentalism, or into a pantheistic obliteration of the differences between right and wrong, still in itself it is a good spirit, and, when properly directed and controlled, is so far a sign that our age in this respect is endeavouring to fashion itself more according to the pattern of Christ. Good too are the fruits which this spirit is bearing more and more every year, in the manifold schemes and institutions for improving the moral condition of the lower orders,—in all that is done to humanize and to Christianize them. The Reviewer however rejects all sympathy with such a spirit. He refers two or three times to the passage, where I say, with plain reference to the story of the woman taken in adultery, that he who is conscious of no sin in like matters, may cast a stone at Sterling, but that I cannot. He seems to think this very strange, very reprehensible. Doubtless he would readily have cast a stone at Sterling, or at the adultress, had he been present,—nay, even at Him who did not condemn the adultress. A

thoroughgoing Pharisee has no consciousness of any sin or fault, moral or intellectual.

On one point, where a grave censure is deduced from a misapprehension of the facts, I must stop to correct that misapprehension. The Reviewer says (p. 400), that "it appears from the narrative that Archdeacon Hare had —urged Sterling to take holy orders at a period when he must have been conscious that the tendency of his early education was negative. When a person holding Archdeacon Hare's situation tells us that he has strongly urged a man of sceptical and unsound views to take holy orders, —a man with whose opinions he was fully acquainted,— we must say that an encouragement is at once held out to any amount of indifference, however criminal, in the choice and recommendation of candidates for holy orders. What condition can be more essential to the due exercise of the Christian Ministry, than a firm belief in the doctrines of Christianity? Such was not a qualification at any time possest by Mr Sterling." In this passage there are two false statements, which at all events betoken a determination to make out as heinous a case as possible. It is utterly false that Sterling at no time possest a firm belief in the doctrines of Christianity. The Memoir of his life shews that for a long time he did receive those doctrines fully. So did he for a long time receive the Scriptures as inspired, although his view of the mode of inspiration differed from the common one. Again, it is not true that I was acquainted with Sterling's "sceptical and unsound views," and with the negative tendency of his early education, at the time when I recommended him to take orders. Of course, in the narrative of his life, I have spoken of his early education, before I speak of his

taking orders; whence the Reviewer jumps to the conclusion that I must have known of the former before the latter. In a person so deficient in clearness of thought, this blunder might have been excusable; although, as in so many cases the beginning is one of the last things we come to, thus it mostly happens that the last part of a friend's life, of which one hears much, is the beginning. But I have expressly said in p. viii. that the information concerning his early education was communicated to me "*in later years;*" which the Reviewer would have attended to, if he had not been so absorbed in imagining mischief against me. The intercourse between a tutor and pupil at our large colleges in Cambridge is very seldom close enough for the tutor to become acquainted with the intellectual and spiritual state of his pupils, except so far as it may be disclosed in connexion with the studies of the place. From the year during which Sterling attended my classical lectures, I knew him to be highly gifted: I knew that he was an ardent lover of truth, upright and conscientious, generous and affectionate, careless about himself, when he heard the call of Duty. Was I wrong in inferring that such a man, if he took orders, if he felt that he could do so conscientiously,—and I was sure he would not do it, unless the act approved itself to his conscience,—would be a good servant in the ministry of the Church? Was it very reprehensible, on occasion of some allusion to his future profession, to place the ministry before him as the noblest of all fields of action? The result confirmed my judgement. So long as he was allowed to act in the ministry, he devoted himself zealously to his work; and the beautiful paper inserted in pp. xlix—liv. must convince every one of this, except a man who fancies that the whole of religion

consists in telling the beads of an orthodox rosary. Would that thousands of our Clergy were animated by the spirit which breathes through that paper? We should not need the bead-tellers then; nor would they harm us.

The next short paragraph of a dozen lines contains two falsehoods at the least. The Reviewer states that Sterling pursued the study of German Theology with "a zeal not inferior to that of his friends" (Mr Hare and Mr Maurice). Here is a falsehood by implication; inasmuch as the sentence implies that Mr Maurice was a diligent student of German Theology, to which he has never given much time, and which at that period he could hardly read: and this falsehood is brought in to prepare the way for a series of others, with the view of making out that Mr Maurice is a patron of German Theology. In Sterling's latter years, the Reviewer next says, "his anxiety for the overthrow of existing beliefs and Churches was overwhelming." It would have been nearer the truth to say that his dread of that overthrow was overwhelming. What but this is implied, for instance, in the passage which the Reviewer quotes? "If I saw any hope that Maurice and Samuel Wilberforce and their fellows could reorganize and reanimate the Church and nation,—I think I could willingly wrap my head in my cloak, or lay it in the grave, without a word of protest against aught that is. But I am well assured that this cannot be." However he may have misjudged the actual state of things, or the right mode of improving it, his most earnest, intensest desire was that the Church should fulfill her mission, that she should be a living power in the nation, leavening and ennobling the whole mass of the people. Every symptom, every promise of this he hailed with delight,—such as I have stated in

p. ccxii. he felt on reading Archdeacon Manning's Charge in 1843,—such as he was inspired with about the same time by his intercourse with Mr Charles Marriott, whom he met in the Isle of Wight.

The next paragraph exemplifies the danger of coining facts out of incidental expressions, especially when the coiner is not very scrupulous. "It was, doubtless (the Reviewer says, in p. 401), the boldness and speculativeness of Sterling's views, which gathered around him the friendship of a host of congenial minds, sympathizing in the general complexion of their theological and philosophical tendencies, though separated by strongly markt differences in points of detail. We only miss one name from the circle, who ought to have held a conspicuous place there; we mean Blanco White. But the names of Hare, Bunsen, Carlyle, Coleridge, Emerson, Thirlwall, Maurice, Francis Newman, John Mill, Samuel Wilberforce, Arnold, and Trench, are familiar to all the readers of this work as the friends and associates of Mr Sterling,—the subjects of his warmest admiration and deepest sympathies." The purpose of this statement, as of the whole article, is to make out that there has been, and is, a kind of confederacy and conspiracy against the Faith, in which all the persons here named are more or less implicated, and to render each one of them in great measure responsible for whatever of errour the Reviewer can detect, or fancy he detects, in all the rest. Sterling's life, he says, "reveals a link between writings and doctrines, which we mentally class together almost involuntarily, notwithstanding their differences in many points, but which we could hitherto only connect by their tendencies. In Sterling's life however these various systems are brought together as parts and off-shoots of one great

movement, each playing its part, and allied by secret ties of sympathy with the rest." I will not stop to talk about such rank nonsense as *mentally classing* writings and doctrines together *almost involuntarily*. The Reviewer indeed does so; and therefore his whole article is a mass of confusion. An "almost involuntary" classification, with regard to such things, is a mere medley. The only one of any value must be intelligent, must proceed on distinct grounds, carefully examined and ascertained. But his whole fabric is imaginary. Several of the persons mentioned were not even among Sterling's friends. What was more natural than that he should occasionally see persons who were intimate friends of mine, and should mention them in writing to me? Thus he twice met the Chevalier Bunsen, once, I believe, officially, when applying for a passport. With Bishop Thirlwall he had a very slight acquaintance, though a warm admirer of his writings. Arnold, with all his admiration for that great man's heroic energy, if I am not mistaken, he never saw. Bishop Wilberforce, I believe, was only known to him by a few casual meetings in general London society. The only ground for the introduction of his name into the list is the mention of him in the letter just quoted. Sterling, in writing to Mr Trench, who at the time was Curate of Alverstoke under Archdeacon Samuel Wilberforce, having doubtless heard some account from him of the good his Rector was doing in his Parish, gave utterance to the thankfulness he always felt, whenever he saw earnestness and conscientious activity; and therefore Bishop Wilberforce is brought in to figure in this antichristian conspiracy. The motive for the insinuation is, that the Reviewer may afterward fabricate a connexion between him and the persons who took

part in resisting the agitation excited by the appointment of the Bishop of Hereford. He has a singular faculty of seeing what is not, a faculty which seldom goes along with the more valuable one of seeing what is.

It is true, he acknowledges more than once, that there are wide differences of view "in details, and even on points of the highest importance" (p. 436), among the various members of this School, as he calls it. "But still (he says) there was a profound sympathy between them, a consciousness of general oneness of tendency amidst all their contradictions in detail." The characteristic of this School he conceives "to consist simply in the striving after intellectual liberty, a tendency to reject all which does not commend itself to the individual reason as right and true, a tendency to resist *authority*, of whatever nature it may be, which interposes any restraint on the freedom of speculation." Now if there is any meaning in these words, as expressing a quality common to the various persons, whom, in spite of many great diversities and oppositions, the Reviewer has ranged together as members of the same School, it must be that we all seek, or desire, according to our ability, to seek, Truth and Justice in all things, and above all things,—that we cannot sacrifice our reason and our conscience to empty forms and lifeless conventions,—that we cannot bow down to any Baal whom public opinion may set up, even though his house should be full from one end to the other,—that we cannot recognise any great value in a belief, unless it be a living faith,—and that the desire of our hearts is, that men should live, as alone they can truly live, by faith. Of some of the writers mentioned I know very little: but those I am most familiar with have this spirit in common; and, to judge from what

I have heard, and from the little I know of the others, the chief of them seem to be animated by a like spirit; notwithstanding the enormous difference, that to some has been vouchsafed a far clearer insight than to others into that living Truth, which came down from heaven to satisfy all the cravings and yearnings of the human mind, and without which those cravings can never be stilled, without which man must ever be preyed upon by unappeasable desires. If this be our School, of which we shall all readily acknowledge ourselves to be the most unworthy members, members by desires and longings and feeble aspirations, not by actual attainment, then is it the same School to which all the great and the wise have belonged in all ages, from Solon and Aristides and Socrates down to Clarkson and Wordsworth, and the chief masters of which are the Apostle Paul, and the other chief divines in Christ's Church. O too that any of us, yea, that all of us, may mount to higher steps in that School! that we may all be enabled to discern more and more of that living Truth, which came into the world to be the Light of the world in the midst of its natural darkness! O that we might be enabled to gather multitudes into our School, and to transmit it unimpaired in power and glory to after generations! To that end, among other things, may we never cease to strive, with inextinguishable hatred, against that evil spirit, which upholds the interests of its own party, without regard, and often in opposition to Truth and Justice: and when we are waging battle against errour, may we do so, not with anathemas or legal penalties, but with the arms of Reason and of Love. To the Reviewer it seems strange that I should have "stept forth as the apologist of Dr Hampden, who is of a different

school in some respects;" as though that were to cost me a single moment's consideration, when it became my duty to act in a matter of simple justice. "Thus again (he adds), Mr Maurice steps forth to remonstrate against any censure on Mr Ward's doctrines, the very opposite of his own." To this sentence he subjoins a mark of admiration at such portentous impartiality. His mind is so cribbed and cabined by party-spirit, that he cannot conceive how a person should be animated with a desire of justice toward any one who differs from him in opinion, nay, should watch over his conduct with severer jealousy when there are such temptations to lead him astray,—how he should deprecate the trial of any culprit by a tribunal, over which, he knew, this party-spirit would exercise such sway. He cannot understand how you may be indignant against detraction and slander, from whatever side it may proceed, and whoever may be its object. Of course he cannot understand this. If he did, he would have thrown his article into the fire, or rather could never have written it.

A curious instance of the manner in which he tries to implicate a man's friends in his errours, occurs in p. 402. He there quotes the passage in which, after speaking of Sterling's college friendships, especially with Mr Trench and Mr Maurice, I state that, "with the help of the latter, he gradually emancipated himself from that corrupt and cramping system of opinions in philosophy and taste, which he had brought with him to college:" and immediately after these words he asks, "Are we to understand that the *negative* views, of which Mr Hare speaks, were shared by Mr Sterling's friends?" What can well exceed the malignity of this insinuation? for which there is not the shadow of a ground, and which flies in the teeth of my

statement that Mr Maurice was Sterling's chief helper in his emancipation from those negative views. Has the Reviewer no friends, except those who hold the selfsame bundle of dry chips by way of opinions? Can he not conceive friendship existing without such an agreement?

Throughout the article he shews an especial desire to involve Mr Maurice in the offensive opinions which he ascribes to the other members of the supposed School, by lugging in quotations which may seem in any way, however remotely, to express a somewhat similar train of thought. Why he has done this, may be divined, when, on coming to the end of the article, we find a retractation of a charge which had been made against Mr Maurice in the preceding number of the Review, with the same levity and disregard of truth so conspicuous in this,—a retractation however unaccompanied by a single word of regret or apology for having given vent to a groundless calumny. The necessity of making this meagre, unmanly retractation, which will be found further on to have been compulsory, has not unnaturally provoked an ungenerous mind to console itself by trying to attach other stigmas to Mr Maurice; though the imputations are entirely at variance with the whole body of principles openly and boldly and continually inculcated in his numerous works.

In fact this is the purpose which led the Reviewer to string together the list of names quoted above, as it is of the whole article. He wanted to make a violent attack upon certain persons, among whom Mr Maurice and I are the chief objects of his animosity. He wanted to accuse me of infidelity, to hold me up to public abhorrence as a teacher whose covert purpose is to propagate infidelity; and he also wanted to bring in Mr Maurice as in

some way or other an accessory in this crime. Doubtless too, if he could drag us to the stake, he would seize the torch and kindle it. This is the light in which he would have people see truth, a light supplying the warmth which his doctrines have not in themselves. In this spirit he says in p. 409, "We feel perfectly satisfied that,—if such writers, for instance, as Sterling or Hare were to throw their whole strength into the cause of infidelity, backt by the Rationalistic theology of Germany, the result of the struggle would be only fatal to themselves and their theories. Let them only speak out distinctly enough at once; and the matter will, we believe, be soon brought to a close in the discomfiture of the antagonists of faith. There is much to lament in the condition of England; but it is not yet prepared to part with Christianity, or to hold it only as a better species of Heathenism,—a philosophy,—a mere fabrication of the human mind." As my dear friend is removed far away from the region of these controversies, this malignant blustering must be aimed at me: and so it must needs be understood by every reader, even by those who, knowing something of my writings, must be aware how shamelessly false it is. What does the Reviewer mean by talking of my throwing my whole strength into the cause of infidelity? How dares he apply such language to me? Has he quoted a single sentence from any of my writings which can afford the shadow of a plea for such an allegation? Not one. It is true, he does not charge me with having done so. He only puts the case hypothetically, with a malice worthy of an Iago,—*If I should do so.* Of whom does he say this? Of a clergyman,—can he be a brother clergyman?—of one who holds a high office in the Church,—of one who has been

publishing a considerable number of works on religious and ecclesiastical subjects in the last ten years? Are the contents of those works,—is their tone,—is their spirit,—such as to afford any ground for a suspicion that the writer is likely to throw his whole strength, or rather his whole weakness, into the cause of infidelity? The two chief of my writings are *the Victory of Faith*, and *the Mission of the Comforter*. Do not the very titles of those two works repell the Reviewer's insinuations? Or does he mean that the whole of these works from the title to the colophon is a mere tissue of lies, a mask put on by one whose real secret desire and design are to subvert the faith which he preaches? Or has he no meaning at all? and did he merely wish to throw dirt, knowing that, when it is pelted at a person by a ragamuffin in the street, some of it is sure to stick, if it be but foul enough?

Nor does this insinuation stand alone. Others follow it in subsequent parts of the article, no way inferior in malignity. Thus he says in p. 419, "We gather from some parts of Mr Hare's book,—that Mr Hare himself, at least, does not embrace Mr Carlyle's positive creed on the subject of Pantheism, though he speaks strangely enough of the FASCINATION of Pantheistic tendencies." Here again Iago shews his hoof. I am a minister of Christ's Church in this land. Every Sunday, in the presence of the assembled congregation, and in the sight of God, I pronounce the Apostles Creed and the Nicene, and offer up prayers to the Father through the Son: yet the Reviewer tells the world that he gathers from some parts of my Memoir of Sterling, that I do not embrace a positive belief in Pantheism. Again I ask, does not the very title of the work which he has set at the head of his article, *the*

Mission of the Comforter, refute this calumnious insinuation? I will not stoop to cite any passages in disproof of it: else the first paragraph of the Preface would suffice.

But I have spoken of *the fascination* of Pantheism: and the Reviewer, to denote his horrour, prints this word in capitals, which, along with italics, form his strongest arguments, and the most pungent ingredients in his style. Of course, according to his conception of Pantheism, as "a theory which recognises the Deity in every brute, in all matter, however loathsome or offensive to the senses, or even in men polluted with crimes and impurities" (p. 410), one cannot wonder that he is unable to understand how it should exercise any fascination, or that he should exclaim, "Surely fatuity never appeared in a more repulsive and ridiculous form than this!" Yet the fact unquestionably is, as the whole history of speculation has proved, that Pantheism has exercised a wonderful fascination on the profoundest and subtilest intellects that have devoted themselves to philosophy, from the earliest schools of Greece to the most recent of Germany. Nay, even among great Christian divines, as we see especially among the mystics, many have only been able to resist the intellectual fascination of Pantheism through the living faith which animated them. Many have been perpetually hovering on the brink of it; not a few have fallen lower. When we have taken the measure of the Reviewer's ignorance on speculative subjects, we shall not wonder that he should be ignorant of all this. Rather should one wonder that he should deem himself entitled to talk about Pantheism, unless one remembered that knowledge is always requisite, in order to know one's own ignorance, and that ignorance, in

proportion as it is ignorant of other things, is above all ignorant of itself.

A like recklessness is manifested in p. 414, where he says, "Mr Hare remarks very correctly, that the criticism of this writer (Strauss), which eats away *all* the facts of Christianity, must undermine all its essential doctrines; and this sufficiently accounts for the repugnance which he manifests to receive the doctrines of this remarkable work." Hereby he plainly insinuates that, were it not for this objection, I should not be unwilling to give up the facts of Christianity; and this he does, without alledging a single word I have ever written, to support his malignant insinuation, without ever thinking of looking into any of my writings on such subjects, which, from first to last, give the lie to his impudent calumny; the temper of my mind having always led me to dwell with peculiar fondness on the facts of the Sacred History. He is not aware of this, it is plain: he merely flings about his slanderous insinuations at random: but this hardly lessens his guilt.

The same purpose dictated the title placed at the head of the article. By every paltry trick, no matter how fraudulent, the Reviewer has set himself to excite the suspicion, the jealousy, the fear, the abhorrence of his readers against me, and, though in a less measure, against Mr Maurice also. For that we are the chief culprits arraigned, no reader of the article can well doubt. Several other writers are indeed brought in by the way, but mainly in order that the criminality of the errours imputed to them may fall upon us. We on the other hand are the objects of continual attacks: we are kept before the reader throughout: and the concluding denunciation is manifestly aimed at us, more especially at me. "It is time

(the Reviewer there says) for all whose faith remains firm and deeply rooted, to look with distrust on any man who recommends the study of a Theology tainted by incurable scepticism. It is time to resist, and to denounce, those who would thus, in vanity or in treason, undermine our *faith*. As it is, all such men are under the influence of public opinion; they *fear* it. They *know* that the national mind of England is strongly adverse to their views. They know the principles of the clergy as a body; and they are fearful of provoking a strong reaction. The advocates of the Christian faith, as we have received it from the beginning, have therefore only to unmask, and to hold up to the public condemnation, the sentiments of all who are directly or indirectly promoting the subversion of religion." Now, ludicrously, monstrously, wickedly false and slanderous as such words are in reference to my beloved friend and brother, Frederic Maurice, and,—I call God to witness,—to me also, there is no other person spoken of in the article, to whom the Reviewer can be conceived to have meant to apply them. He cannot be speaking of Sterling, or Coleridge, or Arnold, or Blanco White; for he is evidently speaking of the living. He cannot be speaking of the Chevalier Bunsen; for he is speaking of Englishmen. Nor can he be speaking of Mr Carlyle; for he is speaking of writers on theology. He may have other unnamed persons in his eye; but we are manifestly selected as the representatives and leaders of the noxious School; and on us the wrath of our countrymen is invoked. We are the persons whom he charges with the guilt of undermining the faith of the English Church, "in vanity or in treason." What he means by the word *vanity* here,—and he repeats it in a like position in two or three other places,—it is hard to

guess; unless it be a proof of vanity to have entered upon a field of study, on which the Reviewer, it is plain, has never set foot. The meaning of *treason* is clear enough; and, unless the whole passage has been instigated by the Father of lies, it is no more than we should deserve.

Now, when a man who has any sense of honour, or even of honesty, utters such words, he will also bring forward proofs to establish them, to shew that there is a warrant for suspecting us of such diabolical wickedness. Seeing that we are writers, and are denounced as such, he will seek the proofs in our writings. This however the Reviewer does not; and he does it not, because he cannot. *Every man shall bear his own burthen*, is the rule of Divine Justice, and that to which human Justice endeavours to approach. This rule however the Reviewer defies; and his whole article is a gross violation of it. He charges us, not with our own sins, but with a mass of evil which he conjures up from the writings of our friends; and in framing the list of these he proceeds, in some cases on very slight grounds, in others on none. Of the persons enumetated as Sterling's friends, several are among those whom I most love and revere, and whose friendship I count among the chief blessings of my life. With some of them I have only a slight acquaintance, with some none at all. In opinion I concur more or less with some of them: to that which is peculiar in the views of others I have rarely exprest anything but repugnance, either directly, or implicitly, by contending for truths which they seem to me to disparage or to overlook. But, whether I concur with them, or differ from them, I must protest from the outset against the practice of holding a person responsible for any opinions, except such as he has distinctly avowed, not even

for what may appear to be their legitimate consequences. Logically indeed these consequences may fairly be urged against him, to shew the fallaciousness of his premisses, but not morally; for who can tell whether, if he had been distinctly aware of these consequences, he might not have been led thereby to reconsider, and perhaps to reject, the premisses? This protest I make the more confidently, because more than once, in my Charges, I have earnestly exhorted my brother Clergy to keep watch over themselves, lest they should be tempted to follow the habit, which has been so sadly prevalent of late years, of imputing the guilt of all the extravagances, into which any person connected with what is called the Tractarian party might be led, to the whole body, even to those who deplored, and were striving to repress these errours.

But there is a further step in the art of detraction, which the Reviewer may boast of as his special invention. The mixture he had been able to extract from those whom he called Sterling's friends and associates, was not deadly enough: so he drags in Blanco White, for the sake of pouring the damning drops of poison into the caldron. He had remarkt significantly in p. 401, that "we miss one name from the circle, who ought to have held a conspicuous place there; we mean Blanco White." He would not however let it continue missing: Blanco White, as well as Sterling, had written in *the London Review:* he had received some letters from Coleridge: *ergo*, the weight of Blanco White's errours, though he was a total stranger to Sterling, is chargeable on all Sterling's friends. This procedure however after all is borrowed from the Inquisition. If you have not exprest such an opinion, some friend of yours has, or some acquaintance, or some friend or acquaintance of

one of your friends or acquaintances, or some one of whom you have spoken kindly, or some one whom you have quoted; and you have not informed against him and denounced him: therefore you are guilty of it yourself. In the name of Truth and Righteousness, let all honest men combine to cast this spirit out of the Church.

In mixing up his potion for the public, the Reviewer's ignorance throws some ingredients into the caldron, his obtuseness of apprehension others, while the main part are mere falsehoods. Thus, in p. 411, he quotes a passage in which Sterling speaks of Schleiermacher's Discourse at the grave of his son, and remarks, that it is richer in imagery than his usual style, adding, "You see Schleiermacher opens with images; and the style then runs smoother and more equably; and such, I think, is the natural course of passion. I cannot but connect this with the bursts of fact-imagery and phenomenal wonders at the first crash of each of the great epochs of Revelation. If this makes you laugh, I do not know that it will have done any harm." Hereupon the Reviewer exclaims, "We own ourselves to be in no small degree surprised at the estimate which Sterling had evidently formed of his correspondent, whom he supposed capable of treating as a matter of levity, a sentiment which distinctly resolves the facts and miracles of the Bible into imagery supplied by an excited imagination. We are equally surprised at the publication of this correspondence by Mr Hare.—We might at first sight almost infer that Sterling understood the temperament and the views of his tutor, when he supposed that such speculations would make him laugh; but we believe that the real object of the editor was simply to extenuate the faults of the subject of his memoir." How my publishing this letter was to do

this, if the Reviewer's interpretation be correct, it requires his illogicalness to explain. So too, in that case, would it have been an almost inconceivable act of folly in me to have printed this letter, thus "unmasking" myself as a mocker and scoffer. Strangely moreover has he misapprehended the exceeding delicacy and refinement of Sterling's mind, in supposing that he would have insulted a friend and a clergyman with such a jest. But the whole accusation is grounded solely on a gross blunder, which might have been excusable, if the Reviewer had not just before quoted the following passage from the same letter: "I am far from denying the possibility that, in the earliest times, and especially at the great epoch of the constitution of a Monotheistic nation, all things may have been in a more outward state, and connected themselves necessarily with more visible manifestations of the spiritual system around us and within us." What great mischief is implied, if Sterling supposed that I might laugh at the somewhat extravagant analogy, which he had drawn between imagery, as the language of passion, and miraculous acts, as the expression of the power of Faith at the critical epochs in the history of Religion?

In p. 406 the Reviewer adopts the practice, so common among those who take pleasure in hunting down heretics, of perverting the meaning of extracts, by garbling them. He transcribes the following words from the conclusion of my Memoir: "We cannot arrest the winds or the waves; nor can we arrest the blasts and tides of thought. These too blow and roll where they list. We may indeed employ them both; but to turn them to account we must suffer ourselves to be impelled and borne along by them." Here he stops, omitting the concluding

words of the sentence,—" without fainting at the thought of the perils we may have to encounter, and in the hope that, with the help of our heavenly compass, we may render those tumultuous elements subservient to the good of mankind." Why he omitted these words, becomes plain a few lines after ; for he could not otherwise have said, as he does, that I " deem it expedient to be impelled and borne along by the blasts and tides of thought, *even if they are infidel in their character.*" The words extracted are indefinite, and might be written by a Christian, or by a mere worshiper of humanity and of human progress. The words omitted determine the meaning of the others in a sense directly contrary to the slander he wishes to cast upon me ; and therefore honest Iago omits them.

Of course I shall not be tempted by the Reviewer's defiance to enter into a discussion on the inspiration of the Scriptures. He fancies that the only reason why those who cannot adopt the popular view on the subject, do not straightway promulgate another view, is personal fear. Having his own opinions ready cut and dried, as he received them from his teachers, he cannot conceive why others should find any difficulty in the formation and exposition of theirs on this mysterious and delicate subject. He does not understand how they should hesitate to bring forward what they feel to be immature and imperfect, nor how they should shrink from the shock it would be to many pious persons, if they were led to doubt the correctness of their notions concerning the plenary inspiration of every word in the Bible. I heard, not long ago, of a person who declared that, if a single date in the Scriptures were proved to be inaccurate, his whole faith in Christianity would fall to the ground. Poor man ! what must be the

worth of such faith? How much less must it be than a grain of mustard-seed! It will never remove mountains, nor even mole-hills. But, though this is an extreme case, it has been seen again and again,—for instance, at the establishment of the Copernican system, and recently on occasion of the modern discoveries in Geology,—that many persons are sorely troubled, when the conviction is forced upon them, that the Bible was never meant to be an infallible encyclopedia of all science. Through our deplorable want of a theological education, such views are very common, not merely with the unlearned, but even among our clergy; and no right-minded man will speak on this matter, without a deep feeling of the responsibility, which, as Dr Pusey truly says, "ought to accompany every syllable spoken or written on a subject so important." The very judicious argument on this topic in the fifth Chapter of the second Part of Dr Pusey's Reply to Mr Rose sufficiently proves that different views concerning the nature and extent of inspiration have been held in divers ages of the Church, even by the most orthodox divines, and that such differences are no way subversive of the faith, or even injurious to it. Nay, far more serious danger is to be apprehended from the attempt to uphold an erroneous view, when a general conviction of its untenableness is gaining ground. In such cases distrust is apt to extend from the erroneous adjunct to the truth with which it is connected. Though Dr Pusey has since retracted his work, his arguments, and the authorities he cites, are as strong as ever.

On another point, with regard to which the Reviewer might be expected to be more at home, his views are strangely confused. One might have supposed that he would at all events have known something about the great

ecclesiastical controversies of our times, and of the age of the Reformation: yet he seems to have no conception of the difference between the idea of the Christian Ministry and that of the Priesthood. Hence he deems it a "comical inconsistency" in the Chevalier Bunsen, that, while on the strength of St Peter's declaration, and of that in the Revelation, he follows Luther in asserting the Universal Priesthood of all Christians, he should yet be desirous of establishing a Ministry of Bishops and Presbyters in the Prussian Church. With a similar confusion he accuses me, in p. 441, of having indulged in "attacks (we cannot call them anything else) upon Episcopacy"; a somewhat strange accusation against a person, who, in his Charges year after year, has been strenuously urging the desirableness of a large increase in our Episcopate. If the Reviewer had attended to what he read, he would have perceived that the object of my repeated attacks is not Episcopacy,—which I have always held to be the best form of Church-government,—but the hateful antichristian notion, which has been broacht so often of late years, but which was disclaimed by our best divines in former ages, that Episcopacy is an indispensable condition to the existence of a Christian Church, nay, even to the power of the Word and of the Sacraments, so that they who are not living in an episcopal Church, have no portion in Christ, and are left, like the Heathens, to the uncovenanted mercies of God. The Reviewer complains immediately after of what he calls my "pernicious hint that Episcopal ordination in England was not required by law till long after the Reformation." *Pernicious* might seem a strange epithet, as applied to the mere statement of a fact on the authority of Clarendon, which might be supported by many others. If the statement is

incorrect, let it be corrected; if not, how can it be pernicious? The epithet however has a meaning: for history is pernicious, truth is pernicious, to all narrow, arbitrary, exclusive systems in religion, as in every other province of human thought or action.

The only remaining topic, which seems to require notice, is the accusation urged against me on account of what I have done, or rather what the Reviewer asserts that I have done, to promote the study of German Theology. This accusation is brought forward over and over again, with continually increasing fierceness, until all faithful Christians are called upon, in the passage already quoted from the conclusion, to resist and to denounce those who would thus "in vanity or in treason undermine our *faith*."

Here let us begin by considering what the fact actually is,—a consideration of some importance in determining whether a person is innocent or guilty, but which the Reviewer wholly disregards. Finding that actual facts are pernicious, he fabricates such as he thinks will suit his purpose. After speaking of what he calls my "attacks upon Episcopacy," he proceeds: "These, though important matters in themselves, are infinitely less so than the deliberate and persevering efforts of this writer to promote the study of theological systems which are deeply tainted with heresy and infidelity. The danger and the criminality of such a course is in no degree diminisht by the fact, that Mr Hare is himself careful to avow his belief in the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and other cardinal doctrines of Christianity. (Here again Iago's hoof comes out. The reader is led to infer that I just take care to guard myself from the suspicion of not holding the doctrines, which I am deliberately and perseveringly undermining.) — On such

men as Mr Hare rests the responsibility of having assiduously fostered that taste, which is now being gratified by the publication of English translations of Strausses *Leben Jesu*, Jean Paul, Fichte, Neander's *Life of Christ*, and other mischievous publications of the same kind." Now one thing at all events is plain: the cause must be prior to the effect. If it is through my act and deed that the taste for German Theology, which is now seeking food in translations of infidel works, has been produced, my deliberate and persevering efforts to promote the study of German Theology must have preceded these translations, and the taste which they fostered. But did they? The Reviewer never thought of asking himself this question. The first work in which I have spoken concerning the merits of German theology, in which I have done anything to promote its study, is the Volume of Notes to *the Mission of the Comforter;* and that was publisht in June, 1846. There may be some half a dozen incidental allusions to German divines, and quotations from them, in some of my earlier writings; but that is all. When I call to mind how much I owe to some of the great divines of Germany, I feel almost surprised, and half ashamed, that I should have allowed so long a period of my life to pass away without attempting to correct the erroneous and ignorant notions on German Theology, so prevalent in England, the disgraceful confusion of that which is good in it, with that which is really evil. The Reviewer will doubtless ascribe this delay to that fear of public opinion, and of the Oxford movement, which he imputes to me in pp. 443 and 437. The simple reason is, that the notes on *the Mission of the Comforter* are the first work in which I have laid anything like a theological disquisition before the world; at least with the

exception of an anonymous Pamphlet, which my brother publisht five and twenty years ago, in answer to an attack on the Resurrection of our Lord, and in which he inserted a little essay of mine defending the authenticity of the Gospels against the vulgar infidel objections. Such being the state of the case, the power of my writings must be almost miraculous, if all this taste for German Theology has sprung up, and fructified so abundantly, from the publication of my Notes two years and a half ago. Many however of the English translations were prior. When that of Strauss was publisht I know not. I heard rumours of it several years ago; and I happen to have a letter from the late Mr Rose, written in April 1836, telling me, "T. says that from two forein booksellers he finds that they have sold a large number of copies of Strauss; and Black and Armstrong said that they had had five several offers of translations." Doubtless the Reviewer will reply that this zeal to translate such an infidel work sprang from the taste for German Theology, which was to be fostered by the Notes to *the Mission of the Comforter*. Though these were not publisht till ten years after, why should not coming books also "cast their shadows before?"

Hence whatever of demerit, or of merit, is connected with the introduction of German Theology into England, is due to others, and not to me. Perhaps I ought to have taken part in the controversies on the subject earlier; but the unwillingness to obtrude my notions on public observation, until I had acquired a fuller acquaintance with that Theology, prevented me. Mr Hugh Rose and Dr Pusey did infinitely more to draw men's minds in that direction than I did,—the former, by a somewhat inconsiderate attack, founded on a hasty, superficial glance

over an immense field of literature, — the tendency of prohibitions and invectives having mostly been to whet the very appetite they would repress, ever since man ate the forbidden fruit, —and Dr Pusey, by his very judicious, calm, and learned apology. To Mr Henry Rose too belongs the merit of having rendered the name of Neander honoured in England; of whose *Life of Jesus* I know little, having merely consulted it occasionally to look at his interpretation of particular passages; but whose History of the Christian Religion, though of course not faultless, as no work on such a subject can be, is among the most precious books of modern times, bringing out the manifold expressions of Christian faith and life, in all ages and under all forms of the Church, in the spirit of truth and of love. In such matters however individuals only act under an impulse which cannot be resisted or evaded. If Dr Pusey and the two Roses had not done their work, it would have been done by others; and the five proposals for a translation of Strauss, so soon after the publication of the original, shew how little good is to be done by the most vehement denunciations.

Another count of the same indictment occurs in p. 423. "The German philosophers and writers on religious subjects (we cannot bear to call them theologians) such as Kant, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Strauss, Nitzsch, Neander, Paulus, &c., were especial objects of admiration to Blanco White, just as they were to Coleridge, and to his disciples, Mr Hare and Mr Sterling." This strange jumble of names, while it demonstrates the Reviewer's chaotic ignorance of German philosophy and theology, and the proneness so often found in connexion with ignorance to bark at every stranger, bears witness also of still worse faults, of which we have

already seen too many proofs. Among the seven writers here named, five stand in the high places of literature, and in various ways have deserved and received a crown. But, along with these five, the Reviewer, by his "almost involuntary," that is, random process of classification, ranks Strauss and Paulus, and asserts that these also are "especial objects of my admiration." Now not only is this utterly false, but the Reviewer himself well knew that it was so. For a few pages back, in p. 407, he writes thus: "Does not the warning which Mr Hare gives in condemning the perusal of Strausses *Life of Jesus* apply equally to the German Theology in general? 'If we walk through mire, some of it will stick to us, even when we have no other aim than to make our way through it, much more when we dabble about in it, and sift it.' Such too must be the case with those who pass through any sort of moral mire." The Reviewer first quotes these words for the sake of condemning a literature, of which, it is manifest from the whole article, he knows nothing; and then, a few pages after thus perverting their meaning, he has the audacity to assert that Strauss is an "especial object of my admiration." So too, as we saw in p. 20, had he spoken of my "repugnance to receive the doctrines of this remarkable work," when he thought he could turn this repugnance into a matter of accusation against me. To see the name of Paulus among my favorites surprised me even more. For he is a writer toward whom I have always entertained an intense, intolerant disgust, having been revolted by his shallowness, vanity, and presumption, whenever I have lookt into his writings. Even in my Brother's Pamphlet mentioned above, I gave utterance to this disgust five and twenty years ago; and, having

been led to mention him in two places,—I have no recollection of any others,—in the Notes to *the Mission of the Comforter*, in one (p. 481) I say, speaking of his exposition of John vii. 38, as compared with that of Noesselt, Rosenmüller, and Kuinoel, that "there is small choice of rotten apples." In the other passage, p. 922, having referred to the *Life of Jesus* by Paulus, I add, "if indeed it be allowable to cite books which belong to the reptile order of literature." The former of these passages at least must, I think, have fallen under the Reviewer's eye; for he has made several references to the remarks on German Theology in the next three or four pages. Yet he asserts that Paulus also is one of the "especial objects of my admiration." Have I not much reason to fear that this Letter will induce him to rank himself also amongst them?

From the whole article it is evident, as I have said already, that the writer knows nothing of the theologians and the theology he is reviling. There is no indication of his being able to read their language; and even with the translations which have been publisht, his acquaintance is very scanty. Hence it is natural that he should be exceedingly angry at my presumption in reprehending the practice, so disgracefully prevalent, of unscrupulously condemning and railing at German Theology, with little, if any, knowledge of it. To me, I confess, it has always seemed that a careful examination of the subject matter is an indispensable preliminary to pronouncing judgement upon it: but this notion gives such offense in England, and is so abhorrent to the procedure of our writers on theology, that one might almost suspect it must be a German heresy. At all events the Reviewer, it

is plain, feels that to trench upon the privileges of Ignorance is a personal injury and insult.

Such being the value of his criticisms, I will not say anything further about the various writers whom he carps and sneers and growls at, some of whom he rebukes me for praising, while with regard to others my sin consists in mixing censure with my praise, or praise with my censure, and not condemning them summarily and sweepingly on the mere score of their being Germans. But I must make an exception in behalf of Olshausen, whose *Commentary on the New Testament* is a truly precious work, fitted to be of the greatest use to our English students of divinity; as has been acknowledged to me by a number of pious clergymen, with affectionate gratitude for having been led to his rich spiritual banquet, after being half starved on the meagreness and dryness of our common English exegetical Theology. That this excellent work should be reprobated by your Reviewer, will not disturb any one, as he manifestly knows nothing about it, and merely abuses it in order that his abuse may glance off upon me. But in this instance he follows the authority of a writer in *the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal* for last December, though exaggerating and distorting the observations which he repeats; whereby that which was already incorrect and unfair, becomes utterly false and unjust.

When one examines the censures, which, even in these days, are scattered about in our religious literature concerning German Theology, one might almost fancy that our writers must be visited with a judicial blindness, whenever they touch upon that theme. Nor would such a suspicion be far from the mark. For what is judicial blindness, except that which we bring upon ourselves by our own

sin? If we choose to walk in the dark through an unknown region, we are sure to stray and to stumble; and if we strike out our arms and kick out at every step against imaginary monsters, we shall soon slip and lie sprawling on the ground. If we persist presumptuously in pronouncing judgement on a province of literature, with which we have no acquaintance, or a very slender one, our ignorance will revenge itself upon us by leading us into all manner of blunders. But would not the same thing happen to a sciolist who took up a book in any department of physical science? Would he not be startled perpetually by something strange, by something which to his preconceived notions seemed absurd? Would not a person fare likewise, if, without any preparation, he were to pick up a treatise on logic, and to conceive that he was entitled to condemn as nonsense, whatever he could not immediately understand? Such ebullitions of presumptuous folly would be frequent, were it not that in physical science, and in logic, there is a more palpable line of demarcation between ignorance and knowledge, and that he who has not mastered the elements, is precluded from advancing further. But in theology it is otherwise. There is such an intimate connexion between theology and religion, that, all persons being bound to have a certain amount of religious knowledge, people easily slide into the assumption that they are also possest of theological knowledge, and that they are qualified to pronounce upon the profoundest and most intricate theological questions, without previous discipline or study. It is true, the profoundest problems of theology are involved in the simplest religious acts: Theology exists implicitly in Religion. But so are the laws of the universe involved in our simplest physical acts: yet we do not

conceive that everybody is therefore to have a voice in questions of physical science. Science repudiates universal suffrage; and so does Theology. I am not hereby exalting Theology above Religion: far from it. The true worth and dignity of man, as well as his true happiness, consist, not in what he knows, but in what he does, or rather, in what he is. His knowledge is only precious, so far as it feeds and ministers to his Christian life; even as his actions themselves are only precious, so far as they are the expressions of that life, which, like all life, is strengthened by its appropriate activity. Still does the Son give thanks to the Father, that the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven are revealed to babes, and that the wise and prudent can only receive them by becoming like babes. If to the natural eye the wise and prudent may seem to have advantages, these are far more than counterbalanced by the difficulties and perplexities which increase of knowledge brings with it, as well as by the perilous temptation to count knowledge the highest of all things, and to substitute it for the realities of Christian life and action. On the other hand, while the fulness of a Christian life may exist with a very small amount of knowledge, and though, when it does exist, its constant tendency is to purify and refine the intellectual, as well as the moral part of our nature, yet it will not of itself fit us for passing judgement on theological questions. Rather will it refrain from meddling with that in which it knows itself to be incompetent; and, in the assurance that it has everything in its faith, it will not be troubled by questions lying beyond the bounds of that faith. But where the Christian life is imperfect, it is unable to subdue the self-sufficiency of our nature. Where Faith is weak, it clings to all manner of artificial

supports, and is disturbed and irritated when any of its props are removed, when any of its easy cushions are taken from under it. Hence, this being the ordinary state of the religious, there is ever a proneness among them to step beyond their proper limits, and to pronounce a condemnation hastily and angrily, from wanting the calmness which a well-grounded assurance alone can give, against everything that seems at variance with their narrow, and often arbitrary notions.

I have made these remarks, because it has so often fallen to my lot of late years to have to expose a series of gross misrepresentations in matters pertaining to theology. The multitude of such misrepresentations in these days is quite perplexing and distressing, and almost compells one to look with distrust on every quotation one meets with, while it tempts one to fear that the faculty, either of perceiving truth, or of speaking it, must be passing away from England, at least from our theological writers. Doubtless too there is a great moral, as well as intellectual obliquity involved in this defect. There is a want of candour toward those who differ from us, a rash haste in snatching at anything that seems to flatter our prejudices, a carelessness and sluggishness in the pursuit of truth, an indifference about truth, except so far as it is subservient to our preconceived notions, or to the interests of our party: all these and the other modes of party-spirit have eaten wofully into the heart of the English people, and have drawn it away from the pure contemplation and love of truth. But on the other hand there is also the want of a severe intellectual discipline, of a logical and dialectical and critical training to qualify us for separating truth from errour, and for discerning truth under its manifold forms, and in the midst of

all its accidental accompaniments,—the habit of confounding and identifying the form with the essence, which leads us to assert the indispensableness of our own forms, and to deny the essence, when it manifests itself under other forms. All these habits, whether moral or intellectual, help to explain the exceeding frequency of misrepresentations among our writers on theological and ecclesiastical subjects; more especially when we take into account, that our Religious Journals hold out an inducement to every ignoramus to become a writer, and to bray his ignorance in the ears of a credulous, and weak, and therefore easily terrified public. Thus a writer in *the Irish Journal* for this month, though confessing that he knows nothing of Olshausen, beyond the extracts in the previous number of that Journal, insists, even in spite of a protest by the collector of those extracts, that he has a right to class Olshausen with Strauss, whom he supposes to have attained "the climax of anti-christian literature." Of course, knowing nothing of either, he can see no difference between them. But is it not marvellous that a person, who may possibly be an honest, and even a religious man, after a fashion, should think he can serve the cause of Christian truth, by uttering such a heinous accusation against a divine, of whom he avowedly knows nothing, except that he is held in very high esteem by those who are acquainted with him? Yet, alas! even such a rude bray may awaken an echo, yea, many.

A considerable part of the objections to Olshausen urged in *the Irish Journal*, and taken from thence by your Reviewer, relate to an Essay on the Canon of the New Testament, which the Translator has prefixt to the *Commentary*. This Essay, with which I was not

previously acquainted, seems to be written in the same excellent spirit which distinguishes the work it precedes. Still there are divers things in it which may easily offend such as have never paid any attention to the history of the Canon. Such persons, that is, the great body of Christians,—including the main part of those who adorn their faith by the sanctity of their lives,—are apt to suppose that the Books of the New Testament came out much like other books, and were combined into a whole soon after their appearance. Hence they must needs be startled, if they look into any treatise on the Canon, and find how many controversies arose in the early centuries about some of the books in it, and how long a period elapst before it was finally settled. This is a natural, and an innocent feeling. Yet on the other hand, when theologians have to treat on the Canon,—as it behoves them to do in their vocation,—and to consider the reasons which induced the Church to receive the various books in it,—they are compelled and bound to seek the truth, the exact truth, diligently, laboriously, perseveringly, with the utmost severity of criticism, holding no compromise with any kind of falsehood, suppressing nothing, colouring nothing. They are bound to do this by their responsibility to the God of Truth, who will not be served by lies. Now, when these two forms of thought meet, there cannot but be a shock. The theologian should not hasten this, should not aggravate it; but he must not shun it. So long as such discussions are confined to treatises written for the learned, these shocks will be less frequent. It is one of the mischievous effects of our periodical literature, that such questions are now brought forward as matters of talk, in every family, at every breakfast-table. But who is to

be blamed for this? Surely not the theologian, who fulfills his appointed task of seeking and declaring what approves itself to his understanding, exercised under the sacred controll of his conscience, as truth; but the journalist, who drags such matters before the vulgar eye, often for no other purpose than the gratification of some personal or party spite. Had there been a literature of the same kind of yore, what sheets full of offensive matter might have been extracted from the greatest theological works, from the *Summa* of Aquinas, or from Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium!* Separate a few sentences from the context; state that as positive, which is only put hypothetically or problematically in the course of an argument; you may easily wrest treason or atheism out of the most loyal and pious writers. Thus, for instance, St Paul's words, *Then they also who are fallen asleep in Christ are perisht*, might be twisted into a denial of the Resurrection.

In like manner, if we look at the sentences which are pickt out from Olshausen's Essay by the writer in *the Irish Journal* as peculiarly offensive, in the places where they originally stand, as links in the chain of argument, and if we are at all familiar with such discussions, much of the offense, if not all, will vanish. For example, when we see the following words printed in italics,—"*Now in the whole Second Epistle of St Peter we do not find the slightest thing which can be regarded as erroneous, or as morally bad*,"—we are naturally puzzled and startled. But, when we turn to the original passage, we find that this sentence is merely a link in a chain of argument. After speaking, as he was bound to speak, of the disputes which have existed from very early times concerning the genuineness of this Epistle, and giving all the weight he

can to the positive evidence in its favour, Olshausen puts this dilemma: "Either the Epistle is genuine and apostolical; or it is not only spurious and forged, but was forged by a bold, shameless impostor; and such a person must have had an evil design in executing a forgery of the kind supposed. Now in the whole Epistle we do not find the slightest thing which can be regarded as erroneous, or as morally bad. Its contents are entirely Biblical and truly evangelical. An elevated religious spirit animates the Epistle throughout. Is it conceivable that a man actuated by this spirit can be chargeable with such a deception?" Thus the sentence objected to is nothing more than a repetition of the argument perpetually urged by the Apologists for the Bible, that, the only alternative being to believe the writers, or to assume that they are shameless impostors, the pure morality of their lives and writings must determine the scale in their favour.

Another objection urged against Olshausen is, that he "considers the history of the Gergesene demoniac to offer difficulties peculiar to itself, such as one of the Evangelists speaking of *two* such persons, and another of *one*." But is not this the fact? and is a commentator on Scripture to conceal this fact, or to slur it over? is he to do that which would be universally reprobated as dishonesty in a commentator on any heathen author? is he to take a lesson from your Reviewer in distorting and falsifying what does not suit his purpose? Is there not a difficulty in this discrepancy? a discrepancy and difficulty which have been continually noticed by critics from the time of Augustin downward,—as they could not but be by whosoever attempted to draw up a harmony of the Gospels,—and for which a variety of explanations have been suggested. This

difficulty may indeed perplex those who cling to the vulgar notion of literal inspiration, but, when we take a correcter view, is wholly immaterial. For, as we may always feel sure that truth coheres far better than errour, the correction of our views on inspiration would remove a number of stumblingblocks, which now beset our students of theology, and which they cannot get over except by wilfully closing their eyes to them. Is our criticism to be brought under such bondage to an arbitrary hypothesis, that a pious commentator is to be held up to reprobation because he takes notice of the discrepancies in the Gospels? In the Church of Rome a person subjects himself to condemnation, if he dares to notice any errour in the Vulgate. This practice we reprobate as Romish: but the selfsame spirit is perpetually found even in those who are loudest in railing at the Church of Rome; and they will be no less eager in condemning a person who points out any mistake, not in the Bible, but in our vulgar conception of it, in our Vulgate. This however assuredly is, as it ever has been, a tendency subversive of faith. Faith may easily coexist with much latent, unconscious errour: but when we become conscious of it, we must cut it out; or the mortification will spread through the whole body. Every honest heart revolts from trickery in the service of Religion.

As to the Reviewer's assertion, that Olshausen "considers that the rationalist Paulus was probably right in considering that our Lord's directions to Peter about the tribute-money meant that he was to find the money, not in the fishes mouth, but *by selling* it!"—after which he asks, "Is this the kind of theology which Mr Hare wishes to recommend?"—it is a mere falsehood. Olshausen admits indeed that the explanation suggested by Paulus in this

instance is more plausible than in others: but he then proceeds at considerable length to refute it, though he concludes by admitting, as has often been felt, that there are difficulties of a peculiar kind connected with this miracle. Such a refutation is at all events likely to have more weight with an intelligent reader, than the Reviewer's marks of admiration and italics, even though strengthened by his customary seasoning of falsehood. That falsehood here is his own addition to what he read in *the Irish Journal*, where it is said that "Olshausen states that the explanation of Paulus 'deserves consideration;'" where however, as in the instance before quoted, a most incorrect impression of Olshausen's note is given by the severing of what he says by way of admission in the course of argument, from the answer subjoined to it.

Still, even if the Reviewer's statement about Olshausen were not as false as it is, what right would he have to exclaim at the end of it, "Is this the kind of theology which Mr Hare wishes to recommend?"—at least unless he was prepared to shew that what he had given was a fair sample of Olshausen's Commentary? This is a favorite trick with our theological slanderers, when they cannot find enough fuel for their malignity in the writings of a person whom they desire to injure, to charge him with all the evil they can detect in any book he may happen to have commended. Yet what would be said, if some French critic were to pick out half a dozen ribald speeches from Shakspeare, and then to cry out, *Is this the poetry which all the poets and moralists of England exalt above all other works of the human mind?* Would not such a man be an impudent slanderer? Nor would his slander be less false, if his extracts from Shakspeare were correctly

transcribed, than if they were fictitious. In the Notes to *the Mission of the Comforter* I have given a multitude of examples of the kind of exegetical theology which "I wish to recommend." Is there anything among these in the slightest degree resembling the opinions which the Reviewer would impute to me? If their whole tone and spirit is totally different,—and he will not dare to assert that it is not,—his insinuation is again a gross calumny.

I trust I have sufficiently shewn the futility of the accusation of my having been a main agent in introducing and promoting the study of the infidel theology of Germany. But I am said to have had an accomplice in this work, the imputation against whom would be ludicrously absurd, if it were not revoltingly malignant. Just after the passage quoted above, in p. 30, in which I am charged with this criminal course, the Reviewer adds, "Mr Maurice must be included in the same category as Mr Hare in this respect.—He also anticipates benefits from the study of German Theology." Now what is the evidence to shew that he is a partaker in my criminality in this matter? I have often heard complaints of his having spoken too severely of German Theology; but, in his *Letters to Mr Palmer* on the Jerusalem Bishopric, he has said:—"It is not this Jerusalem bishopric which will bring us into contact, either with that which is most feeble in the Pietistic, or that which is most dangerous in the Rationalizing side of German life. That contact exists already; the commerce is establisht; the sea has failed to be an effectual *cordon sanitaire:* all our devices will assuredly fail also: the question is, how the intercourse may be turned to profit and not to evil. *My own conviction is, that if anything will put an end to what is most vicious in the tone of*

our modern fashionable chapel and bazaar Christianity, and at the same time will call out that which is strong and healthful in the feelings of those who have given their sanction to it, a more extended and less suspicious communion with German thoughts and feelings is likely to produce that effect.—The moment our divines begin to know what their brethren abroad have been really thinking and working at for the last eighty or a hundred years, they must begin to perceive that a merely sentimental religion of comforts and experiences, a merely social religion of coteries and circles, a merely outward religion of excitements, cannot avail in this our day. They must lengthen their cords and strengthen their stakes. They must dare to encounter those awful thoughts respecting God Himself, which occupied the Church in the first ages; they must dare to ask themselves how He has constituted us in ourselves, and in relation to our fellow-men." These latter sentences, printed in italics, are quoted by the Reviewer. The sentence preceding them he omits; because it shews that Mr Maurice is not speaking of the introduction of German Theology as desirable in itself, but as having already been accomplisht, and as inevitable; and that his desire therefore is to shew how this intercourse, which cannot be averted, "may be turned to profit, and not to evil." Yet, on the strength of this one passage, the Reviewer has the audacity to accuse Mr Maurice of conspiring with me to undermine the faith of England by labouring to introduce the infidel Theology of Germany. On the strength of this one passage he denounces Mr Maurice, and calls upon all faithful Christians to resist and denounce him, as one "who would, in vanity or in treason, undermine our faith." This is the manner, Sir, in which you make amends to a person for having uttered a false charge against him, which

you have been compelled to retract. It is an old observation, *Proprium est humani generis odisse quem laeseris;* and the sagacity of the remark is receiving continual verification, even from those who call themselves Christian divines, from those who thrust themselves forward as champions, but in fact are subverters, of the Christian faith.

The rationalizing and infidel Theology of Germany has made its way into England, without Mr Maurice's aid, and without mine. The question is,—how is it to be resisted? how are we to draw good out of this evil? as Faith, we know, through God's help, can out of all evil. We cannot build a Chinese wall, and shut it out. We could not even keep out the Picts by such means, much less the legions in the great army of Thought. The very act of building such a wall is a proof of weakness and degeneracy. When a nation places its strength in outward bulwarks, that strength is verging on its decay. The only true strength is in ourselves, and in God. They who attempt to fence themselves round with penalties and with anathemas, they who go forth with clamour and clatter, like the barbarians against the monster who was devouring the sun, are sure to find before long that their vain confidence itself, their clamour and clatter, become an aggravation of their weakness. The living faith of the nation wanes away, when it is debarred from intercourse with all that has life in it, when it is told that, if it ventures to meet its enemies, it will be as grasshoppers before them. If such a fear comes over our faith, what shall we say? except *Let us go back into Egypt : for there at all events we shall have something substantial.* This has often been seen in Romish countries. Everything connected with religion, in such a state of things, becomes hollow, nominal, unreal. Instead

of a living object of faith, they who celebrate their formal rites in the place where their fathers worshipt, find out after a while that they are dancing round a dry mummy of Orthodoxy. Or, if they do not find it out themselves, the younger generation are sure to do so, and will be scared away by the sightless eyes, and the dark, shriveled features. Hereby many of them will be driven into hostile excesses. In order to combat the spirit of unbelief, which is rushing upon us impetuously from within, as well as from without, we must have a living spirit of faith. Our soldiers must be trained to fight against it with its own weapons, not with the armour and the arms "of the invincible knights of old." Those knights fought with the armour and the arms of their own age; or they would not have been invincible. The spear and the crossbow and the breastplate will not avail against modern artillery. If we are to be victorious in the conflict,—as, provided we do our duty, with God's help we assuredly shall be,—we must use the armour and the arms of our own times. The powers of nature may be marshaled against us; the powers of art may be marshaled against us. But we may make them our allies.

> Winds blow, and Waters roll,
> Strength to the brave, and Power, and Liberty,
> Yet in themselves are nothing. One decree
> Spake laws to them, and said that by the soul
> Only the Nations shall be great and free.

So may all the powers of the human mind, all the subtilty of the intellect, all the aspirations of the imagination, be marshaled in opposition to Faith, if our Faith is faithless; and so will they be. But, if our Faith is strong and faithful, it will wield them as weapons of light to conquer and convince the gainsayers.

It is under this deep and firm conviction, that I have ever maintained, and, so far as power is granted to me, shall continue to maintain and to urge, that we are not to shrink and skulk from the difficulties and the conflicts, which the course of the world, and the aggressions and revolutions of Thought may cast in the way of the Church, but to grapple with them, to surmount them, to overcome them. We shall never fulfill God's purposes by shutting ourselves up in fortresses, and letting the great host of the human mind sweep by. Fortresses in modern warfare have lost their protective power: the hosts march onward; and the garrisons, if they did not surrender, would die out. But let us do our part; let us go onward with the foremost; let us outreason the subtilest; let us outsoar the boldest: for we know that all things shall be subdued under the Son of God, all the powers of the intellectual, and of the moral, as well as of the physical world,—Reason, and Imagination, and Conscience, and Will, as well as Life and Death. German heresy, German infidelity are rushing into the land. English heresy, English infidelity are rising up to meet them. *Art thou also become like us?* each of them cries exultingly to the other. How are we to overcome this confederacy? We shall not do so by putting on the old, rusty and battered armour of the Fathers, or of the Schoolmen. They did their work in their days; and by studying their example we may gain some lessons, how we are to do ours. But our work is in many respects different from theirs. The forms of thought we have to contend with are different; the doubts and perplexities which are bewildering us, are different,—the same indeed essentially, but with great differences in their modes of uttering themselves.

Surely then, in preparing for the battle against this unholy alliance, Wisdom does not bid us reject the aid which German Faith and German Thought may yield us. The Saxons came in of yore as our helpers, and became our masters; but now they are our brethren. Their battle is ours; ours is theirs. We are fighting against the same enemies, for the same Lord. Many of the intellectual combats have already been waged and won by them; and from them we too may learn how we are to wage and to win them.

That there is such a thing as German Faith, that there are precious masses of German Thought, I know from an experience of more than thirty years, for which I shall ever be thankful. In the Notes to *the Mission of the Comforter*, I have endeavoured to prove this, and to offer some hints by the help of which our students may be led to the better sources of German divinity, without going through as long a pilgrimage as has fallen to my lot. This is the amount of my offense. Of course I do not mean to say that any German divine of our age is to be taken as an infallible guide, any more than any divine of any other country or age, since that of the Apostles. But for the wants which are felt by the most thoughtful enquirers of our times, for the difficulties which disturb them, more help can be obtained from the German Theology of our days than from that of all former ages. This is almost implied indeed in the fact of their being our contemporaries. For contemporary, living teachers have ever been those who have exercised the most powerful immediate influence upon mankind; as arises necessarily from the fact, that they are best able to understand the modes of thought, and to sympathize with the modes of feeling,

which prevail in their days. This my conviction of the great value of what is good in German Theology is shared, so far as I have had the means of judging, by all who are really acquainted with it, in proportion to the familiarity of their acquaintance. They who are ignorant of it, deny its value. But what is the worth of a witness, whom one can prove to be non-cognisant of the facts?

Doubtless there is much that is evil in German Theology: there are temptations and snares that may lure the student astray. I have never denied this. The Reviewer himself admits that I have "condemned Rationalism in the gross, and in language the vigour of which is fully equal to that of any writer he is acquainted with:" and for this very reason, because there is so much folly and perversity in it, have I tried to help our students in distinguishing between the good and the bad, so that they may choose out the former, and eschew the latter. But does not the same complication and perplexity beset us in every mode of life? Can any one go through life, without having to make the choice of Hercules? And can this choice be made once for all? Have we not to renew it continually under one form or other? We cannot train up our divines in a hothouse, any more than the other classes of men who are to bear part in the manifold warfare of the world. A hothouse plant, when it is brought out of its shelter, is unable to buffet with the storms: the first frost kills it. This is the order of the world: and they who have any practical knowledge of education, are well aware that to screen a boy from all perception of the evil that is in the world, is not the way to prepare him for encountering that evil in after years; not to mention that the spring of evil is within us, and that this evil will

assuredly spring up under one form or other, whatever pains we may take to keep boys always under a glass. Hence they who are educated thus, while they gain no strength to resist temptation, mostly become insufferable coxcombs, who fancy themselves pure, and that they are defiled whenever they come into contact with the world. One can hardly conceive an education less fitted to prepare a man for the ministry of the Gospel. In truth the whole scheme of the world and all experience shew that the right system of education is not negative, but positive,—that the best way of keeping down weeds is by sowing good seed,—and that our work is to strengthen the heart, the mind, and all its faculties, the will, the conscience, the moral affections, in the faith and fear of God, even as we endeavour to strengthen and perfect all the members of the body, so that the whole man may be fitted for whatsoever work he may be called to. Nor may we indulge the hope of training up our divines in ignorance of the heresies by which the Church is infested. It was not thus that Augustin was trained to fight against heresies. Train them to be strong, strong in faith, strong in the knowledge of the enemies they will have to contend against, strong in the power of wielding all their faculties against those enemies. This will be a far wholesomer diet, than if we fed them with the *crambe recocta* of our own peculiar system.

That German Theology may render us valuable service in the training of our divines, we may in some measure infer from what has already been effected in England by the influence of German Philology. He who compares Bishop Thirlwall's History of Greece, or Mr Grote's, with Mitford's, will be disposed to marvel at the immeasurable superiority of the two former,—a superiority arising, not

merely or mainly from their superior talents, but far more from their better method of exercising those talents, and using their materials, from their having had their sight purged, as it were, to see ancient history in a new light: and I am sure that Bishop Thirlwall and Mr Grote would be the first persons to acknowledge that their chief advantage over Mitford has been what they have learnt from Niebuhr, and from other masters of German Philology. They have not, it is true, merely imported their learning. It would have been of little worth in that case. They have assimilated it, and made it their own. They have assimilated the elements and products of German speculation and research with the peculiar spirit of the English mind, with our practical, statesmanly judgement. A somewhat similar contrast may be discerned, if we compare Arnold's *History of Rome* with his earlier Essays on Roman History publisht in *the Encyclopedia Metropolitana*. In him too it seems as if a scale had been withdrawn from his eyes. Of a similar kind, I feel confident, will be the result in Theology, and that here too our peculiar English gift of choosing out and adopting what is practically good and useful, and rejecting what is excessive and extravagant and merely notional, will manifest itself very beneficially. Nay, we have already seen proofs of this. The great superiority of Mr Trenches works to our common English exegetical writings is evidently owing in great measure to his familiarity with the best German divines. So again Mr Stanley's *Sermons on the Apostolical Age* shew by what discipline he has been trained, and by what learning his mind has been fed, and, excellent as they are in themselves, hold out a promise of greater things to come, both from himself, and from others nurtured in the same school.

Already in the age of the Reformation did our Church derive infinite benefit from the great religious teachers of Germany: and although during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the dominant party in our Church leant too much in an opposite direction, yet, when, amid the torpour of the first half of the last century, a new spiritual life was awakened in England, many of the sparks which kindled it came over from Germany; and Zinzendorf a main agent in rousing Wesley. Unhappily our Church did not cherish these sparks, but cast out him on whom they had lit. Then came a long period during which the star of France was in the ascendent throughout Europe; and nothing flourisht beneath it. Its influence was checking and repressing as to all the higher exercises of thought, until the insurrection of Europe against her political usurpation threw off the intellectual yoke of France along with the political, and revived the consciousness of our Teutonic brotherhood. Since the beginning of the present century, the power of this consciousness has been becoming more and more manifest in the various branches of our literature. Its first organs were Walter Scott and Coleridge. At present one can hardly take up a journal without seeing marks of it.

I do not mean that England has been solely recipient, without communicating anything in return. The intercourse would have been of doubtful benefit, had such been the case; but even the blessings which came to us from the German Reformation, were only a return for those which we had sent to Germany centuries before in the mission of Boniface. The influence exercised by Shakspeare, at least over literature, has been far greater in Germany than in England: and the best German political writers of the

last and the present generation have recognised their master in Burke. Even in ancient philology, the Germans are now importing our Histories of Greece, which were first inspired by them, but which they declare to be far superior to any of native growth, in consequence of the habit of practical, political thought generated by our free constitution. All these things point to the original brotherhood between the English mind and the German. The thoughts which stir the one awaken a response in the other, and are propagated onward: and these influences are totally different from any that either of us has ever received from the other nations of Europe. They belong to another family; we are brethren.

In like manner, while we have been deriving some good at least, as well as evil, from their Theology, one of the first divines now living in Germany, I have been informed, acknowledges that, though he was trained to be speculatively and in doctrine a Christian in the theological schools of his own country, it was only when he came over to England, and saw some examples of Christian life amongst us, and still more in Scotland, that he was awakened to a knowledge of practical Christianity. Many, I believe, would join in a like declaration: and this would indeed be a precious return for us to make for whatever we may learn from their Theology. It is the very thing they want, to keep their Theology from excesses, to give it a Christian substance, as well as form. Not that this is wholly wanting in Germany: numbers of beautiful examples of it are to be found. But still, through God's mercy, the inestimable blessing of practical Christianity, of Christianity as forming the ruling, vital principle of our domestic, and of our personal life, is much more frequent in

England. May it become more and more frequent in both countries! and may this blessed communion of giving and receiving spread more and more widely, and bind us together in closer bonds of union! At a time when we are abolishing all commercial restrictions, it would indeed be a wild paradox, if we were to enact a Bill of Exclusion against the products of German Thought. The worthy dame who tried to resist the incursions of the Atlantic with her broom, would have to hide her diminisht head before the superior wisdom of such an enterprise. As our Missionary Societies, from the days of Schwartz to the present, have found so many of their best, most pious, wisest, and most efficient labourers among our Teutonic brethren, so, I trust and pray, notwithstanding all obstacles, however formidable, may our Church and the Protestant Church of Germany be drawn more and more closely together; and may we thus be enabled to fight the good fight of faith side by side victoriously against the enemies of God and man! Even if we had to avenge ourselves upon Germany for the evil her Theology has done us, this would be the only Christian revenge. But her cause, as I have said, is also ours; and ours is hers: and unwise and base as was the policy recommended during the wars at the beginning of this century by those who would have had us separate our cause from that of Europe, and husband our resources against the day when we should be attackt at home, still more unwise and mean would it be, to shrink from the great religious conflicts of our age, and to wrap ourselves up in the comfortable consciousness of our Anglican orthodoxy, and to go on repeating, *We believe*, *We believe*, till the words died away with our expiring faith.

I have now done with this vindication of myself. The

various accusations and insinuations, which the Reviewer has brought against me, have, I conceive, been fully refuted; at least all that are of any moment. If there are some slighter ones which I have omitted to notice, it is from the wearisomeness and loathsomeness of the task of exposing one slander after another, one misrepresentation after another. A charge may be stated in a line, which it may take pages to rebut. I have said little about what the Reviewer urges against my friends, Dr Arnold and the Chevalier Bunsen, because they are merely brought in for the sake of implicating me and Mr Maurice in the errours imputed to them; and I have already had opportunities of expressing my thoughts and feelings concerning them. On divers former occasions it has been my duty to vindicate one or other of my friends; on one, a person with whom I had no acquaintance, but who laid claim to my sense of justice, when I was called upon to take part in the proceedings against him. These controversies were not without pain; but there was something satisfactory and cheering in their purpose. This has been almost wholly painful and humiliating, to have to vindicate oneself, against such accusations, and such an adversary. I may seem to have spoken of him severely: but let it be remembered what is the heinousness of the charges brought against me, —that I have been denounced as a propagater of infidelity, as desiring covertly, "in vanity or treason, to undermine the faith of the Church," of that Church to whose service my whole life is professedly devoted,—and consequently that my whole life is one huge, base, foul lie: let it be remembered that these heinous charges are brought against me without a single particle of evidence in proof of them, without the citation of a single sentence from my

writings that can warrant them, and that they are supported by a string of slanderous falsehoods, and by insinuations which are almost worse than downright falsehoods. How is such an adversary to be treated? Does it not become a duty to call his offenses by their right name, offenses which acquire a deeper dye from being committed under the name of religion? It may be thought that of such charges one's life ought to be the only refutation, and that it was needless to undertake any other. Nor should I, if they had stood alone: I should have left them to that refutation, or to other defenders. But there was a good deal of censure on my conduct in publishing the life of my friend, Sterling; and being aware that divers good persons, not knowing the circumstances which led me to undertake that work, have been grieved by my having done so, I deemed it right to make the foregoing statement, which I alone could make, with regard to it: and, when I had gone thus far, it seemed impossible to decline taking notice of the rest of the article. For recent experience has confirmed, what had often been seen before, that, when accusations of this kind are left uncontradicted, very many are apt to fancy that no satisfactory reply can be made to them.

Who the Reviewer may be, I have no means of knowing; nor do I desire to know. Let him continue screened by his anonymousness from the shame, which would else fall on such a calumniator. But your duty, sir, plainly is to expell him from the body of your contributors. An officer who had committed such offenses, as I have proved him to have committed, would be expelled from his regiment: a member of a club would be expelled from his club. Shall men who profess to unite as champions of Christian

truth, and of the Church of England, be less studious to preserve their honour unsullied?

To yourself, sir, belongs the guilt of having inserted such an article. This is a different kind of copartnership from that which your Reviewer has tried to establish between me and my friends. Though the Editor of a Review cannot fairly be held responsible for every statement in it, yet assuredly, when he inserts an article denouncing certain ministers in the Church as desiring to undermine its faith, he ought at the least to ascertain carefully that there are good *prima facie* grounds for such an accusation. Therefore from you, sir, I demand a full, frank, manly retractation and apology for the offense which you have committed against me. If you make this, and if the exposure of this delinquency renders you more watchful as to the articles you insert hereafter, your Review may become better fitted for fulfilling the high office it has assumed. If not,—if you shrink from such a retractation and apology,—if, on the contrary, you uphold and persist in the course on which you have entered,—then,—seeing that in all ages the chief hindrances and injuries to the Faith have accrued from the vices of its professors, and that nothing can be more revolting to an honest, truth-loving heart, than falsehood and slander under the guise of Religion,—your Review will have to take an ignominious place among the Tendencies subversive of Faith.

J. C. Hare.

Herstmonceux,
February 5th, 1849.

Mr Maurice, hearing of my intention to answer the attack on us in your Review, sent me the following letter, which I gladly insert.

My Dear Hare,

There is a long story connected with the mysterious paragraph respecting me, which winds up the last number of *the English Review*. I will tell it as briefly as I can. In the number for October there was a notice,—about half a page long,—of my Sermons on the Lord's Prayer. The Reviewer charged me,—"this professor of Divinity," as he called me,—with aversion to the name and idea of a priesthood, with counting it a misfortune that I had been ordained a priest, with being in opposition to the whole Prayerbook. As these charges were professedly deduced from a book consisting of less than one hundred and fifty duodecimo pages, I conceived that the writer of the article could have no difficulty in pointing out the passages on which he had grounded them. I askt him to do so, requesting further that he would lay them before the Bishop of London, my diocesan, and the chairman of the council of the College in which I am a Divinity Professor. The editor replied that he would pay due attention to my note; but that he could not lay complaints before bishops, and he was not a public prosecutor. I rejoined that I thought he was, only that he liked better to bring his accusations before readers who would not examine into the truth of them, than before the bishop, who would: and I concluded my note with saying that the accusations themselves were as false as any which were ever spoken or written. Hereupon the editor wrote to an acquaintance of his, who was much interested in

King's College, urging him to recommend me to be prudent: if I askt more than some salve to my wounded feelings, which perhaps he might be willing to give, he would make an attack upon the divinity teaching of the College generally, and my colleagues would have no cause to thank me for my interference. I knew that my colleagues would have great cause to thank me, if I were the instrument of causing a thorough enquiry into the character of their teaching; and the editor's referee thought so too; however little we might either of us expect from such an enquiry carried on under the auspices of *the English Review*. The editor's friend told him, with Christian manliness and courtesy, that my 'wounded feelings' and his threats had nothing to do with the question. Either the writer of the article respecting me had said that which was true, or that which was not true. If he had said that which was true, he should produce the evidence; if that which was not true, he should make a retractation. It was agreed at length that a paragraph should be sent to the editor's referee and to me, which, if we approved of it, should be inserted in the next number. Six weeks after this correspondence,—within a week or two of the appearance of the January number,—the editor sent a paragraph, in which he said that, after comparing the book reviewed at a certain page of the former number with other books of mine, he found I did not agree with the other members of my school in their opinions respecting the priesthood. He found I did not hold the opinions which are so rife among the followers of Arnold and Bunsen; therefore he hastened to say so. I answered at once, that I was not a follower of Arnold and Bunsen, and that I could not accept such a retractation. I afterwards explained, in a letter to

the gentleman to whom the editor had referred (begging him to forward the statement), that, if by a follower of Arnold and Bunsen, was meant one who agreed with them, or either of them, respecting the Priesthood, the Sacraments, the relation of the Church to the State, not one but all of my books would disprove the assertion. If he meant follower in any other sense, I disclaimed so extravagant a compliment ; for, excepting for those opinions, I did not know that they were remarkable for anything but their high intellectual gifts and moral virtues. The result was, that the editor inserted four lines at the end of the long article, in which he attacks me, in connexion with Arnold, Bunsen, you, and some six or eight more,—which four lines he was tolerably sure no reader would connect with the previous notice of the Sermons on the Lord's Prayer ; and which have left the impression upon at least one intelligent person I have met with in the last two days, that further enquiry had convinced the editor that I *did* hold the notions upon the priesthood, of which he had partly acquitted me in his previous tirade. A more ingenious method of retracting a charge, which the writer solemnly made, and for which he confest there was no foundation in the book which he had reviewed, or in any other of mine he had ever seen,—I do not remember to have met with.

If you should wish to insert this statement in your forthcoming letter, for the purpose of illustrating the morality of your assailant, and of the English religious press generally, do so by all means. But let me beseech you not to use it for the purpose of shewing that my case stands upon a different ground from that of some of the other persons attackt by the Reviewer, and that I am entitled to a separate trial. As far as *the English Review*

and the class it represents are concerned, we all stand precisely on the same ground. *Their* verdict against any one in the list is a verdict against me. I wish to say so distinctly,—expecting fully that the Reviewer will quote the words I have just written, without their explanation, in italics or capitals, and being perfectly indifferent whether he does so or not. All those persons whom he seems to have associated by no law but one of malice or caprice in his article, have, or had, as I think, one characteristic in common. They did, or do, feel, more or less strongly, that the popular English religious systems cannot last,—that the time is gone by when a man may choose which of these systems he will stand upon,—that he cannot stand upon any,—that, unless there be some foundation deeper than these, the pit of Pantheism (I should say, of Atheism) must swallow us up, whether we call ourselves High Churchmen or Low Churchmen, Romanists, Anglicans, Liberals, Evangelicals, or Rationalists.

Of this fact, I say, we all, great or little, learned or simple, orthodox or heretical, known or unknown to each other, were made aware by one kind of discipline or another. And it is this fact which the English Reviewers, and the organs of all our religious parties wish to keep out of sight. By railing at each other, by imputing all existing evils to the people who do not read and admire them, by persuading their countrymen that infidelity can only come to them from Germany, and that ignorant railings against the literature and theology of that country will keep off the infection of it,—by identifying their own schemes with the principles for which Fathers, Schoolmen, Mystics, Reformers, English divines were witnesses,—above all,—and this applies especially to your adversary,—by

boasting that they represent the genius of our Church as it is set forth in her formularies,—by these means they hope still to keep their own plank floating when every other has sunk. Those who tell them it is impossible, must deserve their hatred, their impartial hatred. What can it signify, whether we trust our own wisdom to guide us to the eternal foundations which lie beneath these fragmentary and crumbling systems, or whether we seek the help of German philosophers or divines in the search,—whether we desire to profit by the wisdom of the Church in all ages, or whether we turn with especial love and reverence and hope to our own Formularies? What can it signify, whether we cast the Bible aside in despair, because other men have made it an idol, or whether we turn to it with ever fresh zeal and ardour, and find day by day more light in it to guide our own lives, and to teach us the sense of history? What can it signify, whether we reject the Creeds, taking them to be mere words, or whether we find in the Creeds the deepest of all realities, realities which satisfy all our wants, upon which we can rest our whole being? What signifies it whether we occupy ourselves chiefly in demolishing systems, or chiefly in seeking for the principles in them which cannot be demolisht,—whether we regard these as a new and refined Christianity (perhaps as some substitute for Christianity), or as the oldest Christianity, asserting its might against all that has narrowed and crusht it, proving itself to be meant for all times, for none more than this? Such differences may seem to you and me very important: but let us understand it well: they must seem the merest trifles in the eyes of our religious parties. This is their shibboleth: '*Will you support our system?*' 'No,

never!' '*Which will you support? the semi-Romish, the Evangelical, the Liberal? Each of these is bad; for it is not ours; but it is a* religio licita. *The journalists will allow you to profess it.*' 'So help me God! I will not profess any one of these schemes!' '*Then, sir, your place is there, in that limbo. You will find strange companions. And mark! you think we in our different parties can agree about nothing. We can. We can suspend our battles with each other for a while, and join heart and hand in casting stones at you.*'

This is a tolerably accurate translation, I believe, of the words in *the English Review*, in which we are told that public opinion shall be appealed to against us,—that this is a tribunal which, we know, and they know, we are afraid of. O, my dear friend, that this charge at least may be a libel! Or rather let us assume it to be too true; let us feel and confess that we are tempted,—tempted continually,—to worship the great goddess, whom all the world, the religious world more perhaps than any other, worship; and let us pray the Lord God to deliver us from this idolatry, and to give us grace that we may sanctify Him in our hearts, and make Him our fear, and Him our dread. The English Reviewers have not miscalculated: they are wise in their generation. They can and will appeal to all the bitterness, hardness, cruelty, which are in the English religious mind; above all, to the sense which there is in that mind, of utter insecurity, of the necessity of cleaving to some sect or system of opinions, because it has so feeble a hold on the eternal truths which the Bible and the Creeds set forth. The appeal will be made and answered. You may wonder, since *the English Review* regards your opinions as so dangerous, and invokes the wrath of clergy and laity

upon them, that it has never exposed your *Mission of the Comforter*, or any of your more elaborate works, but should have reserved its attacks for the memoir of a friend, which it cost you days and nights of sorrow to write. Of course upon ordinary maxims such conduct would be monstrous. But it is clever and judicious for its objects. The lower portion of the religious public in England scorns principles, delights in proper names. It is essentially suspicious, as all people, uncertain of their own ground, and conscious that some convulsion is approaching, necessarily are. To pander to this appetite and this fear is the function of the religious journalist. By these arts he has his wealth. The dullest writer on moral and spiritual subjects finds he is listened to when he begins to deal with personalities. *I can't speak as loud as I used to speak*, said an aged wit to a lady who complained that his discourse had become much more bitter and malevolent than it was in earlier days ; *and therefore I am obliged to say things that I am sure the people I mix with will take all pains to hear.*

But there is something surely which is more terrible than the frowns of this public opinion, sweeter than its smiles. It is more terrible to see the sons and daughters of religious families growing daily more discontented with the traditions of their fathers, more convinced that everything they have heard is hollow and insincere, and that the foundations of earth and heaven are rottenness. It would be a higher reward, if we could lead even one to believe that these traditions have an everlasting ground,— that the outside crust of sects and systems covers over, not a deep void, but truths upon which one may rest when they have all crumbled into atoms. It is a more terrible thing that young men should go forth to preach truths to

the people which they do not believe, passing all the while for respectable Anglicans, Evangelicals, Semi-Romanists, afraid to ask themselves what they mean, lest they should find that they mean nothing, talking loudly and noisily against some one else, that they may drown the awful voice which speaks to them from within. It would be a blessing beyond all blessings, and worth encountering all the indignation of all the reviews in Europe for, if we could send forth a few priests, feeling that the word and Sacraments are really committed to them, and that the trust is a most real and awful one, and that they have nothing to do with the catchwords of this party or that, and that they may be messengers of truth and peace to high and low, and that God has indeed founded Zion, and that the poor of his people may trust in it. It is terrible to see the noblest, bravest spirits driven to despair by coldness and heartlessness, led to think the Church the cruelest of taskmasters, instead of the most loving of mothers, led to spurn the very truths which in their inmost hearts they are confessing and longing for,—led to suppose that unity means exclusiveness,—to confound Christ with Belial, the Father of Lights with the spirit of lies. O! surely we might bear the reputation of being at one with infidels, of being infidels, a whole life long, not only among the dark and base, but among the good and gentle, if, by our sympathizing with but one such spirit, we could persuade him that God is true, though men be liars, that the Gospel is as true and large and free as ever it was, that it can satisfy all the special longings and cravings of this time, which are so absolutely incapable of satisfying themselves.

The English Review has fixt with admirable sagacity upon the crime with which I am chiefly chargeable. It

complains that I agree with those who in this day, and in former days, have declared liberty,—liberty of conscience, heart, reason, spirit,—to be the great blessing of man. I plead guilty to the charge. I believe that the history of the Bible is the history of a Redemption, that we do not know God till we regard Him as a Deliverer,—that we do not understand our own work in the world,—least of all the priest's work,—till we believe that we are sent into it to carry out His designs for the deliverance of ourselves and of our race. On this ground I have always placed my defense of our Liturgy and Articles. Other people speak of them as a bondage too heavy to be borne: I know I have found them blessed instruments of emancipation. They have broken innumerable yokes from off my neck. I am sure they will do the same good work for all my countrymen who will use them faithfully. I wrote a pamphlet thirteen years ago to maintain that the Articles would set the student of Theology and Humanity free from a number of narrow and tyrannical systems. I am preaching a set of sermons now to shew how the Prayerbook may serve still more effectually to free both clergy and laymen from moral and spiritual thraldom. My teaching must therefore be most offensive to the English Reviewer. I would gladly challenge him to take all means, fair and foul, for finding out heterodoxy in my sermons from the pulpit, or in my lectures to students,—provided the Creeds, the Liturgy, the Articles are taken as the tests of orthodoxy, and if it be a part of orthodoxy to make the Bible a key to all other studies. But I am quite certain that this is not the orthodoxy he looks for. On the contrary he would insist upon a kind of orthodoxy which I hold to be utterly incompatible with it. So long as I hold by the Prayerbook,

I cannot hold by Mr Palmer's book. The Church which the one brings before me is living, free, divine. The other is a fleshless skeleton, a ghastly apparition, which has driven many, I am convinced, who saw it rising at the call of an Anglican enchanter, to seek a refuge in Romish Materialism, or in the formless void of Pantheism.

The last words remind me of a solemn subject, upon which I have not yet ventured to speak. The Reviewer will no doubt appeal to your Memoir in proof that his view of the way in which doubters should be treated is right, and mine wrong, that the exclusive theory of the Church is the safe one,—any other perilous. *You have tried your plan*, he will say triumphantly; *behold the result!* I answer, the more boldly, because with bitter shame: experience in this particular instance, as much as Reason, as much as Scripture, convinces me that your method is a fatal one; that the one furthest removed from it is the right and godly one. It is easy to lay down rules: it is another thing to act upon them. I believed many years ago that I ought to sympathize with those who differed from me most widely. I did not follow out my own faith. I engaged in arguments, when I should have sought for the truth which was in the heart of him who was disputing with me. I did not enter into his difficulties, often excused the scandals in our practice, which his conscience rightly condemned, often (having a very slight acquaintance with German Theological literature myself) shewed impatience of his devotion to it, endeavoured to force upon him my own vehement nationality. I can testify,—and, though I have no wish to make a confession, for the sake of others I *must*,—to the evil effects of this treatment. Just so far as I followed the maxims of *the English Review*,—and I did

follow them to a sad extent,—just so far I am certain that I did him a moral injury, which it is bitter suffering to reflect upon. And I can testify as strongly to the entirely opposite, and gentle, and altogether Christianizing influence, which was produced on his mind by the frank, genial, cordial spirit in which he was met by two men, whom even the Reviewer will scarcely suspect of any tolerance for his opinions, Archdeacon Manning, and a dear friend of my college days, Mr Marriott, of Oriel. They shewed him more sympathy than I did, precisely because their moral and spiritual tone was more elevated; and so I believe the case will be always. To them, and to Trench, and to you belong the honour and the blessed recollection of having cheered and soothed his spirit, and given him the hope that the Church might still become a reality: to me belongs the deserved shame of finding that a Reviewer has to prove by a collation of paragraphs, that I was acquainted with a man whom I knew intimately for twenty years, to whom I owe more than one human being almost ever owed to another.

Upon the other and more general question I can speak as confidently. I am certain that he was more alienated from us by what seemed to him the meanness and dishonesty of our different religious schools, than by all the Strausses and Bauers. If I had wanted evidence, his case would be sufficient to convince me, that we have nothing to fear from them, provided only we resolve to reform ourselves. May we be enabled, my dear friend, to engage heartily in that work! We must encounter the hostility of all religious parties and journals; but we may look humbly and trustingly for the help and blessing of God.

Your very affectionate brother,

F. D. Maurice.

You will say a word, no doubt, about the Reviewer's insinuation, that you and others urged Sterling not to produce his opinions too hastily, but to bring them out by degrees, hoping that the world would in time be ripe for them. This charge, which, on account of its meanness, will be most agreeable to many of the readers of *the English Review*, and will sound most plausible to them, will, you well know, seem utterly ridiculous to any one who ever spent an hour with Sterling. Any friend who gave him such advice, must have made up his mind deliberately to a hopeless quarrel with him. His temptation was not to compromise and economize, but to bring out his opinions precisely before the people who were most likely, and who were best able, to confute them. He had no pleasure in startling women or boys; but he spoke of his doubts to men with more than frankness, with exaggeration, concealing the opposite feelings which were in his heart, and resolutely shewing himself in the most disadvantageous light. Though no one was more sensitive about inflicting pain upon others, he seemed to feel that honesty demanded this sacrifice of him. I call it a sacrifice; for I am certain it was one. He did feel isolation and the alienation of friends very bitterly. He thought their feelings were more estranged from him than they were; and I am certain, any pecuniary sacrifice (which the Reviewer very naturally and characteristically takes to be the only possible one, and which it was not in Sterling's power to make, as he had no preferment), would have seemed to him a very cheap compensation for this loss.

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley and Henry Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

POSTSCRIPT.

The publication of this Letter having been accidentally delayed, I am enabled to subjoin a positive contradiction of the Reviewer's assertion in p. 400, that Sterling "commenced life as a follower of that *negative* system in reference to religion, which distinguisht the Edinburgh Reviewers thirty years ago,—*i. e.* in fact as a sceptic." This statement is concocted according to the process, of which we have already seen several instances, by throwing a poisonous ingredient into that which had previously been innocent. I have spoken in the Memoir (p. viii.), of "the crude opinions *on morals and politics and taste*, which Sterling held when he first went to College," and which, he told me in later years were in great measure ascribable to his having read through the whole series of *the Edinburgh Review* in his boyhood. In p. xiv. I again allude to "the crampt and cramping opinions *in philosophy and taste*, which he brought with him to College." Subsequently, in p. cxxviii. where I have to introduce some remarks on the change in his religious views, I say, with reference to the foregoing statement, that "the tendency of his early education had been negative, after that mode of negativeness which we may remember as characteristic of such as drew their opinions from the oracles of *the Edinburgh Review* thirty years ago." I have said nothing about his early religious opinions, for

the simple reason that I knew nothing about them. I speak merely of his opinions "*on morals and politics and taste*," "*in philosophy and taste*,"—with regard to which, when he came to College, he held Mr James Mill and Lord Jeffrey to be the first, or at least among the first living authorities. In asserting that he "commenced life as a follower of that negative system *in reference to religion*, which distinguisht the Edinburgh Reviewers thirty years ago,—*i. e.* in fact as a sceptic," our assailant quietly slips in the words *in reference to religion* out of his mischief-breeding brain, and then draws an inference after his own fashion, that Sterling commenced life "as a sceptic," without any ground for it. Possibly he may have been unable to understand how I could speak of his early intellectual training as exercising an influence in regard to the religious opinions which he adopted in after-life. In those days the religious and ecclesiastical controversies, which have so lamentably distracted the students at our universities of late years, were unknown. At Cambridge, with the exception of a considerable body who attacht themselves to Mr Simeon, hardly any of the young men took interest in doctrinal Theology, unless such as were preparing for the ministry, of which Sterling at that time had no thoughts. The bulk of them were content to hold the opinions which they had imbibed from their parents and teachers: some of the more thoughtful ventured now and then into speculations on the primary questions of Natural Theology. To these the appearance of the *aids to Reflexion* was almost like a new birth, opening their way into higher regions of thought, after they had long been disgusted with the course which the University appointed for them through the dead level of Paley. So barren had our Church been for nearly a

century, that they who hungered after some more substantial and generous fare than was to be met with at the meagre tables of the ordinary evangelical writers, were forced to go beyond its limits, to Robert Hall, to Chalmers, to Irving: for the writings of Horsley and Davison were not of a kind to satisfy their wants. Hence, as religious discussions were not prevalent among the students of Sterling's age, I had no definite information concerning the religious opinions which he held when he was at College; and, being more scrupulous than the Reviewer about the correctness of my statements, I took no notice of this assertion of his, when I was speaking about the context in p. 8. But it is with great satisfaction that I can now state, on the authority of Mr Maurice, that Sterling was a strong believer in Christianity all the time he was at College. Even the Reviewer will hardly argue that this statement is contradicted by Sterling's saying in a letter some years after, "I seem to myself of late to have entered decidedly, and for the first time, into possession of those blessings which are offered to all in Christ's redemption" (p. xlv.). Under divers wholesome influences Sterling's belief ripened into an earnest practical faith, which manifested itself in his ministerial labours, so long as he was allowed to carry them on, and much of which abode with him till the end of his life, even when his mind was most perplext by speculative difficulties and entanglements.

I will merely add, that, after having thus asserted, without any authority, and in opposition to the truth, that Sterling was a sceptic in his youth, the Reviewer proceeds to assert that I knew this fact, which, we see, was not a fact, and then that, knowing it, I strongly urged him to take orders, thus committing a crime for which there is no

conceivable motive, unless I was plotting to degrade his moral being, and to blast the happiness of his whole life. Thus he goes on piling falsehood upon falsehood,—some, knowing them to be such, others, from not taking the trouble to ask himself whether he has any ground for what he has been saying, in his eagerness to say all the evil he can—until the whole rotten fabric falls and crushes him.

J. C. H.

February 17*th.*

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley and Henry Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

ARCHDEACON HARE'S LETTER

TO

THE HON. RICHARD CAVENDISH.

TO

THE HONORABLE RICHARD CAVENDISH.

My dear Cavendish,

I have just seen your name attacht to a document, which I have read with deep pain, as it seems to me to threaten much evil to our Church. Hence I feel an impulse, which I cannot resist, to remonstrate with you on this act. Will you forgive me,—will you forgive your old Tutor, if the recollections of his former relation to you impell and encourage him to address a few words of friendly counsel to you at this critical moment in your life, as well as in that of our Church? Of the pupils who sat in my Lecture-room when I was at Trinity, several have been among the chief friends of my subsequent years; and it has been a happiness to me that I have been allowed to reckon you in this number. Let me make use then of the privilege which rightly belongs to an old friend, and without which friendship would be little better than a shadow, of speaking the truth to you, at least what I firmly believe to be the truth: and I have the less scruple in making this request, because I know that I can speak it in love.

If I have to find fault with the paper to which your name is subscribed, the blame will fall but slightly on you. For it is clear that you can have had very little, if anything, to do with the composition of that paper. Among the subscribers to it are three Archdeacons, two Regius Professors of Hebrew, four beneficed Clergymen, and two Civilians; and some of these stand in the foremost rank of our contemporary divines. You are the only simple layman in the list. In such a company, I well know, your modesty would not allow you to express an independent opinion, on matters on which you would deem your collegues so much better qualified for pronouncing. You must assuredly have been influenced by your deference and respect for some of them, who indeed on ordinary occasions well deserve much deference and respect. Do they deserve the same in this instance? This is a question of no slight importance; because, from the nature of the document, as well as from their personal position and influence, it is plain that they have put themselves forward,—nor does their doing so imply any improper assumption, —as the leaders and guides of a large party in the Church at this time of trouble. I am not going to canvass their pretensions, as grounded on their characters and previous acts. For several of them I feel much respect, though at times I may have been brought into painful collision with them: one of them is a friend whose friendship has been a precious blessing to me. But of them personally I am not intending to speak. I am merely purposing to examine the document they have issued, as the declaration or manifesto of the principles which will determine their conduct at this crisis. By the publication of this manifesto, they evidently invite the concurrence of their brethren, that is,

of all who love their Mother Church, in the principles there enunciated; and hence it challenges the strictest examination. Nor ought one to be deterred from so examining it by any consideration for the eminence of the persons by whom it is issued. Should this manifesto appear to be utterly unworthy of them, it is to be borne in mind, that, according to the old adage, it is mostly injurious to a writing also to have too many authors. Unity of idea and singleness of purpose, the first merits of a composition, are hereby lost; and while one person is introducing this correction, and another that limitation, while one wishes to strengthen this sentence, and another to soften that, the result may easily become contradictory, and almost unmeaning. In this manner strange oversights and contradictions, it is notorious, have slipt, through careless amendments, into Acts of Parliament; as they do likewise into the declarations of inferior bodies. Therefore let me not be charged with presumption, should our examination lead us to conclusions derogatory to the honour justly due to several among the authors of this manifesto.

It is a document of such importance, considering the feverish state of the Church, and the authority which will be attacht to its promulgators, that there is a kind of obligation to go through it step by step. Hence I will take the nine Resolutions, of which it consists, successively, and will subjoin such remarks to each, as may seem to be needed.

The first of these Resolutions, as they are termed, is as follows: "That, whatever at the present time be the force of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter, the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence,

unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby."

Now you will have seen from Note K to the Charge which I have just publisht, that, on the general point at issue, I agree with you and your collegues. When I put together the various passages in our symbolical books bearing on this question, I cannot come to any other conclusion, than that our Church does plainly assert the regeneration of every baptized infant: and that every baptized infant is indeed regenerate, under a right acceptation of the term, I fully believe. Nor is this truth a mere abstract proposition. I believe it to be of great practical moment for our Christian teaching and education. It is because their sins are forgiven them for Christ's name's sake, that St John writes to those whom he terms *little children*. It is for the selfsame reason, that we are empowered to train up our children as members of Christ, and children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. Nevertheless I am most thankful to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for their wise decision, whereby they have done what in them lay to preserve the peace and unity of the Church, and to keep that large body of our so-called Evangelical Clergy within it, who might otherwise have deemed themselves compelled by their consciences to retire, at least from its ministry.

By this sentence, it is true, "the Church of England will eventually be bound," in the same way as the law on other matters is held to be defined by the judgements of the Courts; at least until some opposite or different judgement be obtained in a similar case, or unless steps be taken to procure an alteration or amendment of the law by the proper authority. But,

as judicial decisions in other departments, even when pronounced by the highest tribunal, may be modified, or even reverst, by a subsequent decision *in pari materia;* so, when we have gained a more satisfactory Court of Appeal, may a like case be tried by any Bishop who desires to check the spread of Mr Gorham's opinions, supposing that they should spread: and then the whole question, as to what is the actual law of the Church, would be reconsidered, though certainly at some disadvantage in consequence of this previous decision. Or attempts may be made to modify the law, or to bring out its force more distinctly and explicitly, by an ecclesiastical Synod. I am not saying that I should hold this to be desirable or expedient: but it would be a legitimate mode of correcting what may be deemed defective in the law of our Church. There would be nothing schismatical, nothing reprehensible in such a procedure. Only they who engage in it should do so with a solemn determination of submitting to the decision, whatever it may be, and not setting up their own will against the law; which no man can rightfully resist, unless it be under the constraint of Conscience uttering its supreme voice with reference to his own personal actions.

But when we speak of the sentence as "sanctioning erroneous doctrine," we ought carefully to weigh what its real force is. Many people have fancied that the question at issue was, whether the Bishop of Exeter's doctrine concerning Baptism, or Mr Gorham's, is that of our Church; as though the only alternative were to choose between the two, so that one of them was to be pronounced right, the other wrong. Others suppose that the effect of the decision is to declare that the Church halts between the two opinions, and does

not care which her ministers hold: and this seems to be the view taken by the authors of your manifesto. That there would be nothing monstrous or unheard of in the allowance of such a latitude, we may learn from what Horsley has said in his Charge for the year 1800, concerning the spirit of our Church, with regard to another main question of theological debate: "I know not what hinders but that the highest Supralapsarian Calvinist may be as good a Churchman as an Arminian; and if the Church of England in her moderation opens her arms to both, neither can with a very good grace desire that the other should be excluded." Would that all the members of our Church, more especially the Clergy,—whose occupations naturally render them tenacious of their peculiar opinions,—were rightly imprest with the same conviction, enforced as it is by a number of sayings in the New Testament, and that they knew how to apply it to the other topics of dispute! For this has ever been the course of true wisdom; and that of our Reformers is evinced by their endeavouring so carefully to tread in it. Still this, it seems to me, is not the inference to be drawn from the decision of the Court in the present matter. That decision, although the Judges wisely and dutifully abstain from pronouncing a dogmatical opinion, feeling that this was not their business, and lay beyond their competence, plainly implies throughout, that the doctrine of our Church is to recognise the universality of Baptismal Regeneration. It merely pronounces that the Judges could not deduce from her symbolical books, that this doctrine is laid down so positively and peremptorily, as to exclude every divergence of opinion in the persons who are to minister at her fonts.

Your second Resolution, — "That the remission of

original sin to all infants in, and by the grace of, Baptism is an essential part of the Article, One Baptism for the remission of sins,"—states the dogmatical ground upon which the subsequent ones are founded. For the next proceeds to assert that the sentence of the Court sanctions the denial of this "essential part of that Article;" after which you enumerate what you conceive will be the consequences of that sanction, if adopted by our Church.

Here in the first place let me observe, that, although, when we declare our belief in One Baptism for the Remission of Sins, we undoubtedly imply that through this One Baptism we obtain the remission of all sins, whether actual or original, so far as the term is applicable to them both, yet the Article in the Creed, taken by itself, does not determine the mode of this connexion. It does not lay down in what cases the remission is conditional or unconditional, or what the conditions are, or how the remission may be frustrated, nor again in what cases it is immediate or subsequent. Yet it is through, or in consequence of, our Baptism, "as generally necessary to salvation," that forgiveness of sins is granted to us, not merely at the time, but afterward. It is through our Baptism, as Luther is continually urging, — by throwing ourselves back on our Baptism, and claiming the privilege then bestowed on us,—that we receive forgiveness of our post-baptismal sins. As Jeremy Taylor expresses the same truth, in his *Discourse of Baptism* (§. 18), at the end of the first Part of the Life of our Lord, "Baptism does not only pardon our sins, but puts us into a state of pardon for the time to come." And he there quotes Augustin's declaration to the same effect: "That which the Apostle says,— *Cleansing him with the washing of water in the word,*—

is to be understood, that in the same laver of regeneration and word of sanctification all the evils of the regenerate are cleansed and healed; not only the sins that are past, which are all now remitted in Baptism, but also those that are contracted afterward by human ignorance and infirmity: not that Baptism be repeated as often as we sin; but because by this, which is once administered, is brought to pass, that pardon of all sins, not only of those that are past, but also those which will be committed afterward, is obtained."

I have quoted these passages, though they do not bear on our immediate point, because they shew the wide extent of the power of the One Baptism for the Remission of Sins. Now the Article in the Creed no way defines the various modes in which this mighty power manifests itself, in which the remission of sins is bestowed. It merely states the great spiritual fact,—to use Butler's word,—that through Baptism we obtain the remission of sins. It requires our belief in this, such a belief being essential in order to our entrance into the state of Grace, and to our continuance therein: but that is all. It does not declare that the sins of all persons who are baptized are straightway forgiven: for it cannot be supposed to imply that the sins of adults are forgiven, if they receive Baptism without repentance and faith. Nor does it comprise any definition of the particular effects of Baptism on infants. All that it asserts is, that Baptism is the appointed means whereby, generally and ordinarily, we receive the forgiveness of our sins; that by Baptism we are brought into that state of Grace, wherein, if we rightly claim our baptismal privileges, we shall obtain forgiveness. Nor does this assertion imply any impeachment of the necessity of Faith as a condition of

Justification. Hence those who are called to administer the laws of the Church, have no right whatsoever to impose any particular interpretation of this Article, any exposition of the mode in which the remission of sins is conveyed, except so far as they may be directed to do this by the authoritative Formularies of the Church. Much less has any knot of men such a right, however eminent they may be individually, when they are merely gathered together by an act of their own will. In truth, my dear Friend, I am quite astounded at the conduct of your collegues, who have taken upon themselves to assert, on the strength of their private judgements, that a certain proposition concerning original sin is an "essential part" of the Article in the Creed, and solely thereupon to condemn the decision of what at present is the supreme tribunal of our Church, and therefore is entitled, as the ordinance of God, to our submission,—nay, further, have gone on to declare that unless our Church adopts this their private exposition, she will "forfeit her office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church," will "become formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to her members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins." I have heard many vehement denunciations of late years against the abuses of private judgement: a more extravagant instance of that abuse, proceeding from a sane person, I never heard of. That there is no manifest, essential repugnance in Mr Gorham's doctrine to this Article in our Creed, would seem to be plain, because, so far as I can recollect, it was not even pleaded by the Counsel against him, able and subtile and elaborate as their arguments were; although this single point, had there been any real force in it, would have settled the matter

without further debate. At all events no notice is taken of such an argument, either by the Court of Appeal in their Judgement in favour of Mr Gorham, or by Sir Herbert Jenner Fust in his Judgement against him, although he enters so minutely into the details of the case, and would have saved himself much trouble and difficulty by this one argument. This proves that, if any of the Counsel ventured to suggest it, the Judges, though taking opposite sides, concurred in dismissing it as irrelevant. Most probably too the advocates were too well aware that such would be its fate, to adduce it. I have heard it indeed mooted in conversation, and have already exprest my astonishment at it in the Note to my Charge. It was left for the authors of your manifesto to bring it formally forward as the one ground for condemning, not Mr Gorham merely, but the Judgement of our Court of Appeal, and for threatening our Church with excommunication unless she submits to their dictation and adopts it.

I am no way controverting your proposition concerning the remission of original sin, nor defending Mr Gorham's, whatever it may be. This would be a distinct argument, into which we have no call to enter. But I wish to urge upon you, that we have no warrant for demanding assent to any particular explanation of an Article in the Creed, or to any particular consequence deduced from it, except so far as the Church has defined or expounded the Article in her Formularies. Inferences, which may appear to us essential and irrefragable, may not be seen in the same light by minds differently constituted and trained. Above all is a Court of Law precluded from thus straining and stretching the law, which it is called upon to interpret and enforce. The rule both of justice and equity, a deviation from which would open a gate

to all manner of arbitrary injustice, is that laid down by the Court of Appeal for its own guidance in this case, in the words of that great Judge, Sir William Scott, that, "if any article is really a subject of dubious interpretation, it would be highly improper that the Court should fix on one meaning, and prosecute all those who hold a contrary opinion regarding its interpretation." Of course, if Mr Gorham actually denied the One Baptism for the Remission of Sins, the case would be decided *ipso facto*. But so long as he declares that he believes in that Article, he cannot be condemned legally, because he does not accept our interpretation of it. Ours may be the legitimate interpretation, his an erroneous one: this is a matter for theological discussion, not for the interference of the law. The Church indeed may deem it right to define the Article further, with the direct purpose of excluding his interpretation, according to her uniform practice of defining the Faith more and more precisely, as one errour after another led her to do so. Had the Court of Appeal assumed this right, it would have been taking upon itself to determine doctrine, to do the very thing for doing which it has been so much blamed, but from which it has scrupulously abstained. Would that our self-constituted Popes and Courts of Appeal partook in the same scruples! They fling about their sentences of Heresy, as readily as if they were squibs. Are they not in so doing incurring the woes denounced against those who call their brother *Raca* and *thou Fool?*

The third Resolution, as it states the supposed fact on which all the others hinge, is of course, with reference to the immediate matter of our consideration, the most important of the whole series: "That,—to omit other questions raised by the said sentence, — such sentence,

while it does not deny the liberty of holding that Article in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction the assertion that original sin is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and is not remitted except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace (whereof Holy Scripture and the Church are wholly silent), thereby rendering the benefits of holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious."

This Resolution, I said, contains the one fact, on which all the others turn. The first two lead the way to this: the next four set forth the terrible consequences which will result from it, unless prompt measures are taken to avert them,—how hereby our Church will abandon a main Article of the Creed,—how she will thereby "destroy the divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by her,"—how she will thereby "forfeit, not only the Catholic doctrine in that Article, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church,"—nay, how she will thereby "become formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to her members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins." Then the last two Resolutions suggest the remedial measures by which these dire calamities are to be averted. Berkeley's famous *Siris* would seem to be the model, which the compilers of these Resolutions have set themselves to follow. Yet that procedure, which may be legitimate in a series of speculative propositions, wherein Christian thought may mount by a Jacob's ladder from every point of the earth to God, does not hold out the same stable concatenation in practical matters, in which manifold forces may come across us at any moment, and break the chain. Surely, my dear Friend, it requires an inordinate faith in one's own logical dreams, an

idolizing worship of one's own opinions, to believe that the Church of England, blest as she has been by God for so many generations, raised as she has been by Him to be the Mother of so many Churches, with such a promise shining upon her, and brightening every year, that her Daughters shall spread round the earth,—that she who has been chosen by God to be the instrument of so many blessings, and the presence of her Lord and of His Spirit with whom was never more manifest than at this day,—should forfeit her office and authority as a witness of the Truth, should be cut off from the body of Christ's Church, and should no longer be able to dispense the grace of the sacraments, or to assure her people of the remission of sins, because her highest Law-court has not condemned a proposition asserted by one of her ministers concerning a very obscure and perplexing question of dogmatical theology. Surely, this would be an extraordinary delusion, even if the facts, as stated in the third Resolution, were perfectly correct. For whatever the dogmatical value of the opinion there maintained may be, the errour is not one which indicates any want of personal faith or holiness, or any decay of Christian life in the Church. On the contrary, among the persons who agree more or less with Mr Gorham's view on this point, are many of our most zealous, faithful, devoted ministers. Indeed it is through their jealous zeal for spiritual faith and holiness, that most of them have been led to adopt their opinion, and through their shrinking from the superstitious, pernicious notion of the efficacy of the mere *opus operatum* in the Sacraments.

But what shall we say, if the fact on which these awful consequences have been piled, mountain upon mountain, Ossa upon Pelion, and Olympus upon Ossa, has no existence in reality ? if it is imaginary and fictitious ?

When we take away the foundation, the superstructure must needs tumble into nonentity. Now such, I am thankful to say, is the real state of the case.

For first, whatever may be the opinions held by Mr Gorham, which the Court allows him to hold without incurring deprivation thereby, it does not, as I have observed already, "sanction them equally" with those more generally received. It carefully abstains from deciding anything on this point. The Court felt that they were not called to determine what is the true doctrine, or that generally received in our Church. They declare this more than once in explicit terms, and confine themselves strictly to the one point before them, whether Mr Gorham's doctrine is "contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law establisht," so as to "afford a legal ground for refusing him institution to the living to which he had been lawfully presented." Now this is something totally different from placing the two views on the same level, from "sanctioning them both equally." Your not turning a man out of your house would not be equivalent to receiving him as a bosom friend. Our divines, accustomed to the latitude and laxity of theological argumentation, cannot bring themselves to attend to the minute strictness of judicial decisions, which keep close to the immediate point, and require cogent evidence before they pronounce a condemnation. They are not duly aware how careful our Judges are in refraining from laying down anything like general principles. The Judges in other countries are not so: this is a peculiar feature of our English practical understanding: and in the present question it was especially incumbent on them to tread cautiously in a region which lies so far out of their beat.

But further, what is still more surprising, the very proposition which is here selected as the heresy sanctioned by the sentence of the Judicial Committee,—a heresy so atrocious that this sanction of it, unless we make haste to protest against it, will cut off our Church from the Body of Christ, and will deprive her of her evangelical power, —this awful proposition, "that original sin is a bar to the right reception of Baptism, and is not remitted, except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace,"—not only does not receive any sanction from the Judgement, but is not so much as mentioned in it. You, my dear Friend, will of course have read through the Judgement carefully, before you signed this strong protest against it: whether the authors of the protest did, does not appear from any evidence on the face of it: in fact such evidence as may be deduced from it would rather lead to an opposite conclusion. But you will of course remember the peculiar form in which the Judges found themselves compelled to draw up their Judgement, in consequence of the manner in which the case was brought before them. They complain, you will remember, as the Court of Arches had already complained, and surely not without reason, that no definite issues had been joined with regard to "the particular unsound doctrine imputed to Mr Gorham,"— that, instead of this, Mr Gorham had been charged with divers unsound opinions concerning Baptism, in proof of which the only evidence adduced was the volume containing the Report of his Examination,—and that thus they had been "called upon to examine a long series of questions and answers, —of questions upon a subject of a very abstruse nature, intricate, perplexing, entangling, and many of them not admitting of distinct and explicit answers,—of answers

not given plainly and directly, but in a guarded and cautious manner, with the apparent view of escaping from some apprehended consequence of plain and direct answers." Such being the form under which the case was presented to them, the Court proceed to state the course which they had found themselves compelled to adopt. "In considering the Examination, which is the only evidence, we must have regard not only to the particular question to which each answer is subjoined, but to the general scope, object, and character of the whole examination; and if, under circumstances so peculiar and perplexing, some of the answers should be found difficult to be reconciled with one another (as we think is the case), justice requires that an endeavour should be made to reconcile them in such a manner, as to obtain the result which appears most consistent with the general intention of Mr Gorham in the exposition of his doctrine and opinions."

No one, I think, who has any sense of justice and equity, will question that this was the right course for the Judges to adopt: at least no one will do so, who has meditated on the awful responsibility incurred by men sitting to administer justice, and on the exceeding candour and impartiality, and the caution not to strain any point of evidence beyond its palpable purport, which form the glorious characteristics of our Courts of Law. It is a maxim of our jurisprudence, that the accused is to have the benefit of every doubt, whether on the face of the evidence, or of the law: and I hardly know any grander indication of national character, than the patience and forbearance manifested by our Judges at the trials even of notorious criminals, especially for political offenses, their scrupulous care lest any particle of an argument, which may make for the culprit, should

not have due weight attacht to it. I never read such a trial, without being moved to reverence for the majesty of our Law, which thus tempers justice with mercy. The principle on which they administer it, as is well known, is, that it is better that ten guilty persons should be acquitted, than that a single innocent one should be condemned. Accordingly, in the present instance, the Judges felt that Mr Gorham, and those who agree with him,—for they could not be ignorant that many other persons would be affected by their decision, and this could not but make them still more cautious than they otherwise might have been, — were in a manner placed under their protection; so that, if they could detect anything, either in the wording or the history of the law, which seemed to admit of a construction favorable to him, he was to have the full advantage of it. Hence they may perhaps have ascribed too much importance to certain changes, even very slight ones, in our Articles or Prayerbook, as indicative of an intention to relax their stringency. In like manner, as a judge will often throw his shield over a witness, who has been worried and baited into contradicting himself by a browbeating advocate, so did the Court of Appeal deem themselves bound to give the most favorable construction to Mr Gorham's answers, extorted from him in the course of his vexatious and inquisitorial examination.

Hence it is only reasonable to expect that the opinions which the Judges deduce from Mr Gorham's book, looking at it with their calm, cold, judicial eye, should differ more or less from the deductions drawn by persons searching it with the eager eye of a controversialist to detect the remotest, faintest indications of heresy. It is true that persons who have not been

verst in controversial divinity, may easily overlook heretical symptoms, which a more practist eye would discern; for which reason there ought to be a certain number of learned theologians in a rightly constituted Court of Appeal; though at the same time it is no less requisite that there should be a due admixture of lay judges, to moderate and correct the zeal and partialities to which profest theologians would be prone. No one however, I trust, would dare to insinuate that our Judges in this case have decided otherwise than with strict conscientiousness and righteousness, according to their insight into the matter propounded to them. Their personal character, as well as that of the Bench generally, precludes such a supposition. Now their statement of the doctrine held by Mr Gorham, as ascertained by the above-mentioned process, is this:—"that Baptism is a sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism, that regeneration invariably takes place in baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after baptism; that baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it,—in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that, without reference to the qualification of the recipient, it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace: that infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved; but that in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional." These, and these alone, are the propositions in which the Court sum up their account of Mr Gorham's doctrine. These therefore, and these alone, are the propositions, which they declare not to be "contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law establisht,"

so as to "afford a legal ground for refusing him institution to the living to which he had been lawfully presented."

Now these propositions differ considerably from the one stated in your third Resolution. It may be that yours is also to be found in Mr Gorham's volume: but that is immaterial to our present point; and so I will not take the trouble of searching for it. At all events it has not been extracted by the Judges in their Judgement, and therefore has not obtained that qualified sanction which the Court has granted to the others. Hence you may rejoice with me in thinking that we have no ground for anticipating the tremendous evils, which it has been supposed to portend. Do not say that this is quibbling. In discussions of this kind the utmost precision is indispensable. A slight change in the shade of meaning of a word may completely alter the character of a proposition. Every logician is aware of this; and in no department of science has it been more manifest than in the history of Theology. Above all is such precision necessary when these awful consequences are said to ensue from the proposition.

It may be contended indeed that the representation of Mr Gorham's opinions in the Judgement is much too favorable. I have admitted that it is likely to be much more favorable than that which would be drawn up by a controversial theologian. I have referred to those noble features in the character of our Courts of Justice, their shrinking from straining any point of evidence against a culprit, their aptness to err, if any way, on the side of mercy, their determination to take care that the meanest and worst criminal shall not suffer wrong. Even Rush had every possible indulgence granted to him by the exemplary Judge, who yet

shewed, when passing sentence, that he had the fullest conviction and a righteous horrour of his crimes. What then must needs have been the bias of such a tribunal, when they were called to pronounce a sentence whereby they would have deprived Mr Gorham of his living,—of whom personally I know nothing, but whose Examination proves him to be a man of highminded integrity, as well as of remarkable ability, and who has been serving nine and thirty years faithfully and laboriously in the ministry,—when they were called thus to eject him, not on account of any offense against morals, or even against discipline, not on account of any heretical book that he had publisht, not even on account of a heretical sermon that he had preacht,—but on account of a series of answers, wrung from him, in a manner unprecedented in our Church, and which, I trust, will never be imitated, by a kind of logical thumbscrew. Surely the righteous indignation which such a procedure must needs excite, would constrain the Court in such a case to put the most favorable construction on his opinions. This however greatly lessens the importance of the Judgement, as affecting the Church. Nor can it be held to convey the slightest sanction to any opinions that Mr Gorham may have exprest, except so far as they are comprehended in the statement which the Court has given of them. Among the incidental observations and arguments which the Court has made use of, there may be several questionable positions: it could hardly be otherwise, when they were speaking on matters with which they were not familiar. But the *obiter dicta* of Judges have no binding force, and, in such a case as this, would not be held to have any force at all. The only part of the Judgement by which the Church is affected, is

the decision that a person entertaining the opinions ascribed in it to Mr Gorham is not thereby precluded from holding preferment.

Moreover from this statement we further see, that Mr Gorham's doctrine, at least according to the view of the Court,—and to this point I desire to confine myself, lest my Letter should swell to an inordinate bulk,—cannot "render the benefits of Holy Baptism altogether uncertain and precarious;" seeing that he accepts the assertion in the Rubric, "that, infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved."

As the next four Resolutions are merely successive amplifications and exaggerations of the consequences to be apprehended from the fact misstated in the third, I might here say, *Cadit quaestio*, and drop my pen. Nor should I be diverted from this course by the mere desire of exposing the fallacies in them, unless it were plain that these same fallacies are exercising a wide influence in this calamitous dispute, and are luring many into the fatally delusive notion that our Church is in danger of forfeiting its Catholic, Christian character. Seeing however that this is so, I must still trouble you with a few more remarks.

On the fourth so-called Resolution,—"That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of an Article of the Creed contradictory of the essential meaning of that Article is, in truth and in fact, to abandon that Article," —I will merely observe, in addition to what has already been said on the subject of it, that it requires two important limitations. First, not only must it be demonstratively clear and certain that the exposition is contradictory of the essential meaning of the Article, but the collective body, or the individuals, of whom it can

justly be said that they abandon the Article, must be distinctly aware that it is so. An errour from ignorance is ever a venial errour. So long as we are persuaded that the exposition is compatible with the Article, we cannot justly be charged with abandoning it. As ignorance, if not wilful, is a plea ever admitted by righteous human tribunals, so, we are taught, will due weight be allowed to it at the seat of Divine Judgement. Secondly, it is no way essential to our holding any Truth, even an Article of the Creed, that we should enforce it upon others with penalties. He who sincerely believes himself to be in possession of any divine truth, will indeed earnestly desire that others should partake of the same precious gift; he will desire to communicate it to them: but he will only make use of those means, whereby it can be communicated; and therefore he will not use any constraint, except that of Reason and that of Love. The spirit of your Resolution is lamentably alien from that of St Paul's exhortation to the Philippians: *Let us, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God will reveal this also to you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.* What blessings would descend on our Church, if we could be brought to act thus!

What your fifth Resolution was intended to mean, I am sorely puzzled to divine. It asserts "that, inasmuch as the faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed destroys the divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church." These words were doubtless intended to mean something awful;

but what? That the Faith is One, according to the meaning which St Paul attaches to the words, is indeed certain: that is, those great primordial Truths, which are set before us in the Scriptures, are expansions or emanations or manifestations of one great central Truth, and, as such, constitute that One Faith, which man is called to believe. But, as the unity of the stem does not prevent the tree from expanding in the variety of the branches,—as the unity of the central sun is no way inconsistent with the diversities of the planets, and of their satellites,—so has it ever been with Truth. It has expanded diversely in different ages; as we see, in the Scriptures themselves, how different its expansions were in the Patriarchal Age, in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the Gospel. So again, even after the Incarnation of our Lord, even after His Passion, many truths were still reserved for the teaching of the Spirit of Truth. Thus the Faith, though primarily One, was diverse in its manifestations down to that time: nor has it ceast to be so to a certain extent since, as it has spread itself out to embrace new spheres of life, and ampler regions of thought. Therefore we must beware of confounding the primordial principles of our Faith with their ulterior developments and consequences, and of claiming the same unity and identity for these, which rightfully belong to the others. Exceeding caution is necessary in this matter; because, as the ignorant man in the state of nature makes himself and his own experience the measure of the universe, so, even in our most cultivated state, the proneness to this fallacy does not pass away: man is still apt to substitute his own will for God's will, his own faith for the Faith. Hence, when we are applying the principle of the unity of the Faith to any particular doctrine, it behoves us carefully

to consider whether that doctrine is indeed one belonging to the central stem, or to the diverse, multitudinous branches, under which the nations are gathered, each seeing more of such branches as stretch in its own direction, and loving them more for the shelter it receives from them. As each individual man attaches an inordinate value to those truths which are the most congenial to his peculiar frame of mind and temper, or which the circumstances of his life have imprest most forcibly upon him, so is it, more or less, with nations and Churches, and with different ages of the Church. Each will be apt to exaggerate the importance of its own favorite body of truths, and to depreciate the opposite truths, which are no less necessary to the harmonious unity of the whole: and one extreme ever tends to produce the other. Thus, with reference to our immediate question, the enormous exaggerations of the power of baptismal grace, to the disparagement, and almost exclusion, of the subsequent converting influences of the Spirit, have driven people into the opposite extreme, where baptismal grace has been unduly depreciated. The monstrous assertions concerning a change of nature in Baptism have impelled those, who could not veil their eyes to the fallaciousness of these assertions, to deny anything beyond an outward change of state. These and other like considerations need to be fully weighed, before we give our assent to any special application of the assertion that there is One Faith, or deal severely with those who, in their zeal for some one neglected truth, may be led to disparage another.

But what is meant by the next assertion, that the one faith "rests upon one principle of authority?" How does it rest upon *a principle of authority?* I can understand what is meant by saying that our faith rests

upon authority. In the subjective sense of the word *faith*, the faith of children rests upon the authority of their parents and teachers, the faith of the Christian Church rests upon the authority of the word of God: and that which is said correctly of our subjective faith, may be transferred to the Faith in its objective sense. This however does not explain how the Faith rests *upon a principle of authority*. And what can be the one principle of authority? One may guess that the words were intended to mean, that the faith of the Church is to be determined by the Church; though I see not how they express this. But by what Church? The whole protest shews that the writers of it think their mother Church, the Church of England, is in danger of falling into such errour as would cut her off from the Church of Christ. To her voice therefore they cannot attach much value as having authority to determine the faith. Or is the Church of Rome a less fallible witness? Our nineteenth Article declares that, "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith." Surely they who would be so severe against Mr Gorham for what they suppose to be a doctrine repugnant to our Liturgy, are not themselves contravening the direct assertion of this nineteenth Article. What then is the *one principle of authority?* Is it the authority of their own private judgements?

Nor does the latter part of this Resolution, which is introduced as an inference from the mysterious proposition we have been considering, solve my perplexities. It states that, inasmuch as the one Faith rests upon one principle of authority, "the conscious, deliberate and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an

Article of the Creed destroys the divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church." What is this "divine foundation, upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church?" Can it be the word of God, which in our twentieth Article is declared to be the rule the Church is bound to follow in determining controversies of Faith? But how is this to be "destroyed," and that too by the abandonment of an Article of the Creed? Nay, how can a divine foundation be destroyed? As the critics say, *locus est plane conclamatus:* and I will not weary myself or you any longer by conjecturing its possible meaning. I will merely add that the epithets, *conscious, deliberate, and wilful,* applied to our supposed abandonment of the essential meaning of an Article of the Creed, altogether neutralize the evils, whatever they may be, threatened in the latter part of the Resolution. For assuredly we may say, that, through God's grace, and with His help and blessing, the Church of England will not consciously, deliberately, and wilfully abandon the essential meaning of any Article in the Creed. If she does abandon it, she will do so in ignorance, unconsciously, from not conceiving it to be essential. There seems to be an intention in this Resolution, so far as I can catch any glimmering of its purpose, to apply the declaration of St James, that *whosoever shall offend in one point, is guilty of all,* to errours of doctrine. The truth however, which is exprest in this verse, that a single wilful sin implies the alienation of the will from God, does not hold in like manner of errours of the understanding, which, in its best estate, at present only sees through a glass, darkly and partially.

The sixth and seventh Resolutions are little more than amplifications of the fifth, giving a wider and

wider range to the evils denounced as impending on our Church in consequence of the recent Judgement, and intended to declare that, if she acquiesces in it, she will "forfeit the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church," and will become "formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to her members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins." And who are they, my dear Friend, who take upon themselves thus to pronounce a sentence of condemnation against our Church? By what authority do they pronounce it? Who gave them that authority? One thing at all events is clear, when we compare this hypothetical Judgement with that of our Court of Appeal, that the Church will not gain much in the wisdom and caution of her tribunals by the substitution of clerical for lay Judges. The fallaciousness of the logical process by which these cumulative Resolutions are constructed, might be exemplified by our supposing a sophist to argue, that, inasmuch as the nails are essential parts of the hand, a man who has been cutting his nails has been cutting his hand,—and that, inasmuch as the hand is an essential part of the arm, he has been cutting his arm,—and that, for a like reason, he has been consciously, deliberately, and wilfully, cutting his body,—*ergo*, that he who has been consciously, deliberately, and wilfully cutting his nails, has been cutting his throat. The objections, which have been urged against the preceding Resolutions, apply with still greater force to these. Since it is not evident on the face of the Article, *One Baptism for the Remission of Sins*, that the remission of original sin to all infants in and by the grace of Baptism, solely, immediately, and unconditionally, is an essential part of it,—and since this has not been ruled to be so by any authoritative

declaration of our Church,—our acquiescence in the Judgement of the Court of Appeal cannot be construed into a conscious, deliberate, wilful abandonment of that Article in the Creed. Since the proposition stated in the third Resolution is not sanctioned or even mentioned in the Judgement, the Church cannot be liable to the evil consequences boded from it. Since the Courts of Law are not warranted in assuming any particular interpretation of an Article of the Creed, unless it be unmistakably palpable on the face of the Article, or laid down by some decree of our Church, the dismissal of such an interpretation, even if it was urged upon them as an argument to determine their decision, was the course prescribed by all sound principles of law and equity, and therefore, we may trust, will not bring down any evils on our Church; except so far as evils may accrue from the intemperance and insubordination of her individual members. Nor will our adherence to the One Faith of Christ be forfeited by the admission of diversities of opinion concerning derivative points of doctrine. Through God's blessing, and through the power of His Spirit, who has been moving visibly in our Church of late years, and through whom many of its dry bones have sprung up and been clothed with life, our Church, we may feel a confident trust, will still continue a member of Christ's Holy Body, will still retain her office and authority of witnessing and teaching as a member of that Body, and will still be able to preach the Gospel of salvation, and to administer the sacraments which her Lord appointed, as means for the conveyance of His Grace, and as pledges to assure us thereof.

There is something to my mind quite shocking in the notion, which in the exaggerations of our imagination,

irritated by personal discomfort, people are so ready to assume, that the world is to go to rack, because a man's shoe pinches him. In the Church, in which the providential order of events is far more clearly discernible than in secular history, this utter disproportion and incongruity between causes and effects is peculiarly offensive. How unlike are these prognostics to the causes which are to produce the destruction of the Churches in the Vision of St John! The doctrinal differences between the Greek Church and the Latin did indeed lead to a schism, owing partly to the hierarchal ambition of the latter, and partly to the influence of the dogmatical spirit, which confounded identity of opinions with unity of Faith. But surely the Greek Church, though her differences relate to more important questions, did not thereby forfeit her Christian character and privileges. Or do the authors of your manifesto hold that she did? If not, why should the English?

Thus I cannot but regard the string of Resolutions, to which you, my dear Friend, have been induced to subscribe your name, as utterly worthless, whether we examine the particular propositions which severally they are intended to assert, or look at them in their logical connexion and sequence. But, alas! they are not mere abstract propositions. Had they been nothing more, I should hardly have troubled you with any objections to them; or, if I had, it would have been done briefly and privately. Unfortunately the moment at which this manifesto has been issued, and the names appended to it, give it an importance which bodes no good to our Church. Hence, from the very moment when I first read it, I conceived an earnest desire to do what I could, if I could do anything, to check the mischief it seemed to threaten, by exposing

the fallacies contained in it; and I sat down almost immediately to write this letter to you, if so be your regard for your old Tutor might induce you to listen to his voice of warning. The same motive induces me to publish it, in the hope that it may perhaps help a reader here and there to extricate himself from the confusions and delusions which have been rushing like a thick fog upon our Church.

I have been looking forward for some time with many fears to this crisis, and have already endeavoured to utter a few peacemaking words, in a Note (K) subjoined to the Charge which has just been publisht, and in the Dedication prefixt to it. My chief fear has been, lest, if the decision of the Court of Arches had been confirmed by the Court of Appeal, that large body of our ministers, who agree more or less with Mr Gorham in their views on Baptismal Regeneration,—having reconciled themselves to the use of our Baptismal Service by adopting the hypothetical interpretation of its declarations,—should deem themselves compelled thereby to resign their cures, and to retire into lay communion. Such a result would have been most calamitous to our Church. Numbers, hundreds, if not thousands of our ministers, of the best, most faithful, most devoted among our Clergy, might have been placed in a condition, in which they would have deemed themselves bound in conscience to withdraw from their ministerial office, under the conviction that they could no longer discharge its functions honestly and conscientiously, when the decision of the Supreme Court in our Church had decided that their interpretation of the Baptismal Service was incompatible with the holding of a cure. Hence I felt deeply thankful for the very wise, temperate, considerate Judgement of the Court of Appeal, which

averted this danger, and which, though it may be regarded unfavorably by the opposite party, does not impose any constraint on their consciences in the performance of their ministerial duties.

You, my dear Friend, have signed this vehement protest against that Judgement. Why have you done so? Do you, can you really wish to drive a thousand of the very best, most zealous, most devoted ministers, who are now labouring in our Church, out of the ministry? Is this the way in which you would prepare our Church for the terrible conflicts awaiting her? Has the angel that appeared to Gideon, come to you, and told you that the army of the Lord in this land are too many, and that it is necessary to diminish their number? Are we not hearing every day that we want more ministers, more clergy, yea, by thousands, in order to meet the enormous increase in the masses of our population? It may be that those who would have relinquisht their office, would not quite have amounted to a thousand. But, unless some remedial measure had been adopted, many hundreds would have retired; and thousands would have been placed in sore straits whether to do so or no. That ministry, which they now discharge with joy and thankful alacrity, would thenceforward have been troubled by doubts in their own minds as to the rectitude of their conduct, and by frequent insolent gibes from those, who, having little living faith, and scarcely knowing what it means, are ever the greatest sticklers for forms and the letter of dogmas, the Scribes and the Pharisees of our age. Remember too, the ministers whom we should have lost, would have comprised a very large proportion of those who are now exercising the most salutary, blessed influence on their people, of the shepherds who go before their sheep,

and whom their sheep follow, because they know their voice.

O but they are heretics! My dear Friend, let us beware of using that ominous, terrible word, which in all ages has been a source of such woes and crimes in the Church, and which, I believe, has mostly been used by the ungodly against the godly; which whetted the sword of Simon de Montfort and of Alva, which kindled the fires of the Inquisition, which murdered Huss, and Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, and those

> "Slaughtered saints, whose bones
> Lay scattered on the Alpine mountains cold,
> Slain by the bloody Piemontese, that rolled
> Mother with infant down the rocks;"

yea, which has poured out the blood of God's saints, like water, on the earth. It will not indeed do the same now: but, unless the power of Christ's spirit in the Church silences those who are clamorous in using it, even now it will rend hearts, and wring consciences, and dissolve holy bonds, and sever the loving shepherd from his loving sheep. And what are these heretics? what is their heresy? Do they deny the Lord Jesus? or the Father? or the Spirit? or the power of Christ's Death? or that of His Resurrection? Are they not the very persons who are the most zealous for the glory of the Lord, the most active in winning souls for Him, and in spreading the knowledge and the power of His salvation? Nay, does not the source of their errour in this very matter lie in their zeal for the Spirit? Is it not mainly caused by the exaggerations and extravagances of those, who lose sight of the power of the Spirit in their veneration for an outward ordinance, substituting a momentary transformation for an abiding presence,—and by the misfortune which has

given us an equivocal word, as the point for the whole controversy to turn on? I am not speaking at random, my Friend. I know many, whom an opposite judgement would have placed in terrible straits; and they are among our best ministers, the most diligent, the most loving, the holiest in their lives, the saintliest in their spirits. While you and your collegues have been composing your manifesto, you have not reflected what agonies you were preparing for thousands of God's most devoted servants throughout the land, what wounds for our Church,—unless, as I hope and trust, it proves utterly futile and ineffectual.

You, I know, my dear Friend, would not harm one of God's servants. Their hearts and consciences would be as safe, for any injury you would inflict upon them, as the bodies and garments of the three men in the firy furnace. My persuasion is, that, in signing the protest, you have acted partly under the influence of your friends, partly through indignation that a question so intimately affecting the doctrine of the Church should be brought before a lay tribunal, and partly from your often exprest wish that we should have a properly constituted Ecclesiastical Legislature. On this last point I will say a few words anon. With regard to the tribunal, I see no need of adding anything to what I have already said in the Note to my Charge. But, though I am most willing to acquit you of all blame, except that of adding a somewhat hasty signature to a paper drawn up by your friends,—and most people are too apt to do this without examining the wording, when they concur in its general objects,—yet, much as I should desire to find a like excuse for your collegues, I cannot. From their position they ought to have a far clearer knowledge of the mischief which an opposite Judgement would have

caused. They must know too what kind of effect their manifesto is likely to produce in the feverish condition of our Church. Nay, it is evidently promulgated with the very purpose of producing that effect. When I look at the names subscribed to it, I should expect to find a paper which aimed at quieting men's minds, at calming the troubled waters, at extinguishing the morbid ferment; which gave a sober view of the real bearings of the Judgement; which called on us to revere and love our spiritual Mother, and to abide patiently and dutifully until the fever has abated, and the time comes for taking the steps best fitted for the removal of our grievances. But when I raise my eyes from the signatures to the Resolutions, what do I find? Nothing soothing, nothing healing, nothing pacific; but a vast exaggeration, as I think I have proved it to be, of our present evils, and not one merely, but exaggeration upon exaggeration, and threat upon threat, that, if the Church does not adopt the course they prescribe for her, she will forfeit her divine privileges, and be cut off from the Body of Christ. How has it come to pass that they, who but a short time since were dutiful and loving children of our dear Mother, can use such words concerning her? Duty and Love would shrink from the very thought, would cast it from them as though it were a scorpion. Have they no faith in Christ's watchful care for His beloved Church in this land? for her to whom He has shewn so much love; whom He has so richly endowed; to whom He has given, and is still giving such a glorious mission; a mission in our days more glorious than ever before. Think too, my Friend, what is the time at which these words are thrown about. Will a rational man toss a firebrand into a powder-mill? All manner of loose,

vagrant, uncontrolled desires, and wild dreams, and visionary fancies, discontent with the present, and blind longings for the restoration of some imaginary past, are fermenting in the religious mind of Young England. There are divers elements of fine promise in it, if they can be brought into order,—if men will be content to do their duty in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call them. But that is the very thing they will not do. They will not put on the harness of ancient, establisht ordinances: they choose to frisk about, and to fashion a new sort of harness for themselves. And at such a time as this, when every man is desiring to build a Babel of his own,—at such a time as this, when every one deems that he is called to remould the Church according to his own fancies,—at such a time as this we find grave Doctors and Dignitaries of the Church telling their followers and disciples that the Church of England is on the very brink of forfeiting her Christian character and privileges. How will this be understood? Will it not be regarded by many, —who knows how many?—as a call to quit the foundering ship, and to take refuge,—where? . . in the lap of Delilah . . amid the impostures of Rome. There are they to seek for Christian liberty, for purity of faith, for fulness of unalloyed truth.

I said at the beginning that, if I found much to blame in the manifesto, it would probably be attributable in great measure to its having a multitude of authors. In confirmation of this, let me remark that *the Guardian* of the 20th of this month contains two letters, which, if the initials subjoined to them do not deceive me, are by two of your co-protesters: and the tone and spirit of those letters are very different from the manifesto, and far better, more in accordance with

what one might expect from the persons whom I conceive to be the writers.

I have not toucht yet on your last two Resolutions, which suggest the measures to be taken for the deliverance of our Church from the evils complained of and threatened. You recommend "that all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church should be taken without delay to obtain an authoritative declaration by the Church of the doctrine of Holy Baptism impugned by the recent sentence; as, for instance, by praying license for the Church in Convocation to declare that doctrine, or by obtaining an Act of Parliament to give legal effect to the decisions of the collective Episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual;" or else, "that, failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a re-affirmation of the doctrine of Holy Baptism impugned by the said sentence."

These Resolutions happily will not require many words from me here. As practical measures, they may be discust hereafter, when the course of events brings them before us. With regard to the desirableness of an Ecclesiastical Synod, you are well aware that on the general principle I cordially concur with you; and it was a great pleasure to me to find a layman speaking with such warm interest on the subject, as you have evinced in your Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In that letter you have referred to my argument to the same effect in a long Note on my Charge for 1842, *The Means of Unity*. The opinions there exprest, I still adhere to. If I hesitate in some measure about the expediency of convening a Synod or Convocation at the present moment, my doubts have been caused

by the violence of the controversies which have been carried on since that Note was written, by the painful agitation on the appointment of Dr Hampden to the See of Hereford; by the blind prejudices and the intemperance displayed so wofully at the last two Anniversary Meetings of the National Society, and at the recent Meeting in Willises Rooms: and now this manifesto is come to shew that the very persons to whom I should have lookt, in the hope that they would calm the temper of our discussions, and think it their special duty *motos componere fluctus*, are taking the lead in spreading exaggerated statements of the grievances which we desire to have redrest. In such a condition of things the path of Wisdom becomes obscure, if we search for the signs of present expediency: but I believe that, in this as in other matters, it will brighten before us, if we can bring ourselves to look forward with faith and hope. Therefore, although our perils would be greatly augmented by our having to enter upon such a work, as discussing and legislating for the affairs of the Church, at a moment when men's minds are in this state of hostile irritation, I would fain trust that what would be right at ordinary times, may likewise be so now, and that, if we act upon this general principle, God will direct the issue to the good of His Church.

But as to the more precise definition of doctrine, which is sought, I would hope that, if any measure be adopted, by whatsoever authority, to render the declaration of the universality of Baptismal Regeneration more explicit and more stringent, care will also be taken to clear up the ambiguous meaning of the word *Regeneration*, and to declare that, in its ecclesiastical sense, it is no way to be understood as identical with, or interfering with, or precluding the necessity of Conversion;

which requires a conscious, responsible subject, and is necessary, through the frailty of our nature, in all at a later period of life. The popular confusion of these two distinct acts, which are almost equally indispensable for all such as attain to years of personal responsibility, is the main ground of the ever-renewed disputes concerning Baptismal Regeneration: and a brief authoritative exposition on this point, if we have the wisdom to draw up one, would be of inestimable value to the Church. Without this, the increast stringency in our assertion of it would be incalculably disastrous.

The two ulterior schemes do not seem to need any observations at present. My desire and aim in writing this letter have been to clear up those mistaken notions concerning the nature and effects of the recent Judgement, which seem to me to have dictated your manifesto, and which are so lamentably prevalent. When we see the present rightly and clearly, we shall be better able to provide for the future.

This is the week of our blessed Lord's Passion: this is the day on which He offered up His divine Prayer for the Unity of His Church. O when will that Prayer be fulfilled? Eighteen centuries have rolled away; and still its fulfilment tarries in the distance. No sign of its coming brightens any quarter of the horizon. The world seems to be learning the blessing of peace. The votaries of Mammon are learning it. But the redeemed servants of Christ, the soldiers of Christ, the ministers of Christ,—when will they learn it? Shall they alone obstinately cast it from them? Shall they alone continue to believe that the warfare, to which we are pledged, is, not against sin and Satan, but against each other? Selfishness has still far too great dominion over us; and Selfishness, which may gain some degree of

light in the world, is ever stone-blind in the Kingdom of Christ. We pursue selfish aims, selfish wills, selfish notions: we seek each our own things, not the things of others. We would impose our own notions by force, without trying to win our brethren to them, or recognising the truth which is in theirs. But force cannot convince them: ecclesiastical penalties, deprivation, excommunication, carry no conviction: nor do they even indicate any real, living conviction in those who make use of such arguments. The arguments whereby we produce conviction are the weapons of Reason wielded by the hand of Love. May we ever be enabled to use such, my dear Friend! and may it be our desire to obtain the blessing promist to those who seek peace and ensue it!

Your sincerely affectionate Friend,

J. C. Hare.

Herstmonceux,
Maundy Thursday, 1850.

So much has been said about heresy on this occasion, and the charge of heresy has been tost about so unscrupulously, as though the guilt of it were incurred by a mere errour of the understanding, that I will subjoin an excellent passage concerning it, from the second section of Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*, which may give a clearer insight into its meaning. "The word heresy is used in Scripture indifferently; in a good sense for a sect or division of opinion, and men following it; or sometimes in a bad sense, for a false opinion, signally condemned: but these kind of people were then called Antichrists and false prophets, more frequently than heretics; and then there were many of them in the world. But it is observable that no heresies are noted

signanter in Scripture, but such as are great errours practical, *in materiâ pietatis,* such whose doctrines taught impiety, or such who denied the coming of Christ, directly, or by consequence not remote or withdrawn, but prime and immediate; and therefore in the code *de Sancta Trinitate et Fide Catholica,* heresy is called *ἀσεβὴς δόξα, καὶ ἀθέμιτος διδασκαλία,* a wicked opinion, and an ungodly doctrine.—But in all the animadversions against errours made by the Apostles in the New Testament, no pious person was condemned; no man that did invincibly err, or *bona mente;* but something that was amiss in *genere morum,* was that which the Apostles did redargue. And it is very considerable, that even they of the Circumcision,—who in so great numbers did heartily believe in Christ, and yet most violently retained circumcision, and, without question, went to heaven in great numbers—yet, of the number of these very men, they came deeply under censure, when to their errour they added impiety. So long as it stood with charity, and without human ends and secular interests, so long it was either innocent or connived at: but when they grew covetous, and for filthy lucre's sake taught the same doctrine, which others did in the simplicity of their hearts, then they turned heretics; then they were termed seducers; and Titus was commanded to look to them and to silence them. — These indeed were not to be endured, but to be silenced by the conviction of sound doctrine, and to be rebuked sharply and avoided. For heresy is not an errour of the understanding, but an errour of the will. And this is clearly insinuated in the Scripture, in the style whereof faith and a good life are made one duty, and vice is called opposite to faith, and heresy opposed to holiness and sanctity. So in St Paul: *For,* saith he, *the end of the commandment is charity*

out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned; from which charity and purity and goodness and sincerity *because some have wandered,—deflexerunt ad vaniloquium.* And immediately after he reckons the oppositions to faith and sound doctrine, and instances only in vices that stain the lives of Christians, *the unjust, the unclean, the uncharitable, the liar, the perjured person, —et si quis alius qui sanae doctrinae adversatur;* these are the enemies of the true doctrine. And therefore St Peter, having given in charge, *add to our virtue patience, temperance, charity, and the like,* gives this for a reason,—*for, if these things be in you and abound, ye shall be fruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.* So that knowledge and faith is *inter praecepta morum,* is part of a good life. And St Paul calls faith, or the form of sound words, κατ' εὐσεβείαν διδασκαλίαν, *the doctrine that is according to godliness.* And *veritati credere,* and *in injustitia sibi complacere,* are by the same apostle opposed, and intimate that piety and faith is all one thing. Faith must be ὑγιὴς καὶ ἄμωμος, entire and holy too; or it is not right. It was the heresy of the Gnostics, that it was no matter how men lived, so they did but believe aright; which wicked doctrine Tatianus, a learned Christian, did so detest, that he fell into a quite contrary: *Non est curandum quod quisque credat; id tantum curandum est, quod quisque faciat;* and thence came the sect Encratites. Both these heresies sprang from the too nice distinguishing the faith from the piety and good life of a Christian: they are both but one duty. However they may be distinguisht, if we speak like philosophers, they cannot be distinguisht, when we speak like Christians. For to believe what God hath commanded, is in order to a good life; and to live well is the product of that

believing, and as proper emanation from it, as from its proper principle, and as heat is from the fire. And therefore in Scripture they are used promiscuously in sense and in expression, as not only being subjected in the same person but also in the same faculty. Faith is as truly seated in the will, as in the understanding; and a good life as merely derives from the understanding as from the will. Both of them are matters of choice and of election, neither of them an effect natural and invincible, or necessary antecedently; *necessaria ut fiant, non necessario facta.* And indeed, if we remember that St Paul reckons heresy amongst the works of the flesh, and ranks it with all manner of practical impieties, we shall easily perceive, that, if a man mingles not a vice with his opinion, if he be innocent in his life, though deceived in his doctrine,—his errour is his misery, not his crime. It makes him an argument of weakness, and an object of pity, but not a person sealed up to ruin and reprobation."

While these pages have been passing through the Press, I have seen the Bishop of London's Answer to the Address of the Scotch Bishops, in which he states that he does not believe that Mr Gorham's opinion "is held by more than a very small number indeed of our Clergy." This statement being entirely at variance with that on which I have laid great stress, and have rested a main part of my argument, I will take leave respectfully to remark that a person whose position on the same level with his brother Clergy leads him to a more familiar intercourse with them, and in conversing with whom they are under no constraint, will probably have better means for estimating their real opinions, than

can be attainable by a Bishop, especially in such a Diocese as that of London. I grant that the number may not be very large, who adopt the exact scheme of Mr Gorham's opinions in their entirety,—that is to say, according to the Bishop of London, "hold that the remission of original sin, adoption into the family of God, and regeneration must all take place, not in baptism, nor by means of baptism, but before baptism." So far however as I can form a judgement from the Clergy in my own Archdeaconry, what is termed the hypothetical view of Baptismal Regeneration is still very common among the so-called Evangelical Clergy: nor do I know of any reason for supposing that the proportion in this Archdeaconry differs materially from the average in the rest of England. Now these persons all conceive that their own case is involved in Mr Gorham's, that the point at issue was, whether the Church insists that all her ministers should hold the doctrine of absolute, unconditional regeneration in the very act and moment of Baptism, or whether she will admit of any divergence from this dogma. No mere authoritative edict or decree will make them relinquish their opinions: shame and spiritual impotence would be their portion if they did. But, as friendly discussion and loving persuasion have already induced a large part of this body to entertain correcter notions on questions of ecclesiastical discipline than they did fifty years ago, so would it be with regard to the sacraments: so indeed would it have been ere now, unless the revival of the opposite errour had repelled them. Whether it would have been possible so to limit and define Mr Gorham's opinions in the Judgement, as to insulate him altogether, and make the weight of the sentence fall on the peculiarities of his own doctrinal idiosyncrasy, I cannot

pronounce. If definite issues had been joined, this would have been easier. But it certainly seems to me that, when we consider the manner in which Mr Gorham's answers were extorted from him, the course adopted by the Court, of taking the most favorable and consistent view of his doctrines, was the most honest and straightforward, as well as the most consonant with the principles and practice of our Law-courts; which, I trust, will never make a scapegoat of any man, to appease the rancour of any individual, or of any party. Mr Gorham felt he was contending for an important principle: he did so contend bravely: the Court too seems to have felt this: and though our Judges are perpetually acquitting persons on minor points of law and evidence, they do not, nor, so long as God preserves the heart of England in its soundness, will they condemn any one, except upon broad grounds of law, and compulsory evidence of facts.

J. C. H.

Easter Tuesday, 1850.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE SECOND EDITION.

HAVING to publish a new edition of this Letter, I feel bound to correct an inaccuracy in p. 9, where I argued that there cannot be any manifest, essential repugnance in Mr Gorham's doctrine to that Article in the Creed, which confesses the faith in One Baptism for the Remission of Sins, because, among other reasons, "so far as I could recollect, it was not even pleaded by the Counsel against him, able and subtile and elaborate as their arguments were." I could not at the time examine the various speeches made before the two Courts, that of Arches, and that of the Privy Council, and so was forced to trust, as I intimated, to my memory; which I did with less reluctance as this point was of slight importance, the main ground of my argument being, that, whether this topic was urged or no, it was not noticed either by the Court which decided in favour of Mr Gorham, or by that which decided against him. Whether the objection was omitted by the Counsel, or discarded by the Court as irrelevant, seemed immaterial. Still, as the opportunity is afforded me, it behoves me to state that this point was taken by Mr Badeley. In the Report of the Case publisht by Painter, Mr Badeley is represented as winding up his speech by saying that "the most serious consideration respecting Mr Gorham's doctrine was, that —he was contradicting not merely the Articles of the Church, but the doctrine of the Nicene Creed, which said that there was one Baptism for the Remission of

Sins." From this statement, even if I had recollected it, I should hardly have inferred more than that this argument was brought in by the learned Counsel as a sort of rhetorical climax, but without a notion of its having any real logical force. In the Report which he himself has since publisht of his speech, we see that it was urged with a good deal of oratorical emphasis, as it naturally would be by a zealous advocate; but the logical connexion is much too loose, to make it a ground for a legal conclusion.

From a subsequent incident in the case, it would appear that the Court, though they do not touch on this argument in their Judgement, yet did not pass it over without attention, but discerned its inapplicability on the very same grounds which I have suggested in p. 8. For, in the course of Mr Turner's Reply, Lord Langdale askt, "whether an adult unworthily receiving Baptism, but afterward having faith and repentance, then became regenerate by means of the Baptism previously administered." And on Mr Turner's answering in the affirmative, he continued, "Then, as to an infant, Baptism being received, grace is administered at the same time; because, if he died without committing actual sin, he must be saved. How far that grace extends, you do not venture to declare; but you say it extends to the remission of sin, because an infant being saved has his original sin remitted; and if faith and repentance come afterward, when he has committed actual sin, even then the Baptism that takes place before, is effectual to regeneration." These words may not be reported with strict accuracy, or, being spoken off-hand on an unfamiliar subject, may have been somewhat incorrectly exprest: they shew however that the Judges did not overlook the argument which Mr Badeley had urged, that they considered it,

and found that, whatever it might be theologically, legally it had no force.

At all events, until Mr Badeley arrived at his eloquent peroration, nobody in either Court seems to have discovered that Mr Gorham had been guilty of contravening an Article of the Nicene Creed. Dr Addams had made three long speeches against him, and had never found it out. Dr Robinson, who supported Dr Addams before the Court of Arches, had been equally blind. Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, who had taken more than four months to draw up his very careful and elaborate Judgement, had no inkling of an argument, which, if it had any force, would have enabled him to settle the whole question at once, and which is conceived to do so by such as have never spent five minutes thought upon it. Nay, one may reasonably presume that even to the Bishop of Exeter himself it had never occurred; unless indeed we suppose that in tenderness to Mr Gorham he suppprest what would have constituted the chief gravamen of his heresy, and refrained from pointing it out to his Counsel. For the allegations against Mr Gorham before the Court of Arches on behalf of the Bishop are, that his doctrine is "contrary to the plain teaching of the Church of England in her Articles and Liturgy, and especially contrary to the divers offices of Baptism, the Office of Confirmation, and the Catechism." No hint is given of its being contrary to the Nicene Creed; though lawyers were never before known to err on the side of too little. Moreover in the whole course of the Examination of Mr Gorham, though it extended, with intervals, from the 17th of December, 1847, to the 10th of March, 1848, — and though Mr Gorham was prest with 149 questions, bearing on the single doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and with all manner of authorities, drawn, not merely

from our Articles and Liturgy, but from the Homilies, from *the Institution of a Christian Man*, from the Report of the Savoy Conference,—the Bishop never intimates to him that he was impugning an Article of the Creed. He does indeed bring this forward as his foremost accusation against Mr Gorham in his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (p. 48), and tries to implicate the Archbishop (p. 27), and the Judges (p. 52), in this heresy: he even asserts (p. 52), that one of "the heresies, which came out in his examination of Mr Gorham, and for which he refused him institution," was, "that, by declaring original sin to be a hindrance to the benefit of Baptism, he denied the Article of the Creed, *One Baptism for the Remission of Sins*." This however, we may presume, must be a lapse of memory. Else he would surely have pointed out this contradiction to Mr Gorham in some one of his 149 Questions, and would hardly have allowed it to pass entirely unnoticed in the proceedings before the Court of Arches, a twelvemonth after, and again, nine months later, before the Court of Appeal, until, in the eleventh hour, or rather at the close of the twelfth, it was brought in to give effect to Mr Badeley's peroration. Yet this so-called heresy, which Dr Addams and Dr Robinson, which Sir Herbert Jenner Fust and the Bishop of Exeter himself, though they spent months in poring over the case, were unable to detect, is brought forward in the manifesto which I have had to examine, as so flagrant, that it bodes the destruction of our Church, and has since been spreading from Diocese to Diocese, kindling a general conflagration.

That Dr Pusey, in his *Letter on the Royal Supremacy* (pp. 172—192), should lay great stress on this contradiction, is not surprising, when we call to mind what importance he has long attacht to his peculiar views on

Baptism. But at all events the facts just stated must be regarded as fully exculpating the Judges for not paying more attention to an argument, which neither the Bishop nor his Counsel had thought of, till Mr Badeley's ingenuity discovered it to adorn the conclusion of his speech. Indeed Dr Pusey himself, while he asserts that, "in purchasing tranquil times, as they deemed, the price which they paid away was an Article of the Creed," admits that "they did not, could not know it." As it had been overlookt by so many sharp-eyed persons, who had been trying to spy out all the evil they could in Mr Gorham during two years, no wonder that the Judges, whose business was of a very different kind, did not detect it. In fact, as I have observed, they were clearsighted enough to discern that, as a legal argument, it was worthless. Had they acted otherwise, their conduct would have been repugnant to the first principles of our administration of justice. As the Article in the Creed does not define the mode in which the Remission of Sins is connected with Baptism, the Judges were not warranted in defining it, except so far as they found it defined in the symbolical books of our Church. Dr Pusey indeed asks in his Postscript (p. 230), where he is replying to my Letter, "Have the Creeds one definite ascertainable meaning, *the* meaning in which the Church originally framed them? or may they be construed variously, without limitation, according to the bias of each mind which accepts them, provided his meaning, in his own judgement, come within the words?" and he adds, "surely, wherein the Church meant them to have a definite meaning, that is their meaning, to all who belong to the Church." Hereto it is enough to rejoin by asking, How are we to know the meaning of the Church, except from her words? She did not utter them hastily: she

pondered them maturely: she defined what she thought needed to be defined. In the two primary Creeds more especially, in which each Article is capable of such vast expansion, it would be especially dangerous to include the consequences of an Article within it. We must confine ourselves, when we are enforcing the Articles legally, to their strict, literal sense, along with those inferences which the Church has thought fit to deduce from them. In a theological argument divers other considerations would rightly find place, but not in a legal one, except so far as may be necessary for the right understanding of the words. In the Note to my Charge I have referred to the remarkable instance of this judicial strictness afforded by the recent Judgement on the Factory Question, when the Judge felt himself bound by the words of the Act to decide in opposition to the notorious purpose of the Legislature. Yet I am not aware that anybody has impugned the rectitude of his decision: assuredly no one has insinuated that he had been bribed by the master manufacturers. This extreme literal strictness, which we rightly deem indispensable in the whole administration of our law, so that no one is condemned, for whom the law leaves an escape open, is no less necessary in prosecutions for heresy, which otherwise would be altogether vague and indefinite. With regard to Dr Pusey's other observations on what I have said upon this subject, I do not see that they require any further remark from me than an expression of thanks for their mild and courteous tone. I should merely have to repeat what I have said in my Letter, and to urge again that the Articles of the Creed are of no private interpretation, least of all when they are treated legally, and made the grounds of legal proceedings. A due attention to the difference between the legal and the theological view

of doctrines will remove all his objections to what I have said on this score, as it would a number of the objections against the recent Judgement, which are running from mouth to mouth through the land. What the Judges had to decide, was not what is the doctrine of the majority of the Church, nor even what is the doctrine to be collected generally from her Symbolical Books, but merely whether a certain scheme of opinions was so repugnant to her assertions of that doctrine as to be absolutely prohibited and excluded from her ministerial communion. Had this been duly attended to, our Church would not be in its present state of irritation and confusion.

One might have supposed that this hasty flaring up and blazing at the touch of a spark was inconsistent with the practical habits of the English mind. But alas! we have seen too often of late years, that, in matters in which religion is supposed to be concerned, the English have abandoned that fairness and deliberateness which used to be their special characteristics, and are as apt, as the most fanatical nation, to take up a violent prejudice without enquiring whether there are reasonable grounds for it, and almost to run mad, as Coleridge says of the bulls in Borrowdale, at the echoes of their own noise. Among the latest instances of this are the outcry excited through the land by Dr Hampden's appointment, propagated as it was by thousands who never thought of asking what evil he had done; and still more recently the pertinacious clamour against the Educational Committee of the Privy Council, on account of a matter so petty and insignificant, that one must needs think the bulk of the clamourers have no notion what it really is, and merely clamour because their neighbours do. Another instance, the futility of

which has just been exposed in the most satisfactory manner, is the agitation which was excited at the beginning of last winter against the Post-office; when charges of wilful desecration of the Lord's day were brought, without the slightest evidence, and in defiance of authoritative testimony, at a number of public meetings, against a man who has earned a high place among the practical benefactors of his countrymen, and to whom every letter-writer and reader has continual causes for thankfulness. It now appears that this wily sabbath-breaker was quietly devising a series of measures, by which near six thousand persons have been relieved from a large part of their Sunday-work, at an average of more than five hours each. Yet I fear that few of the clamourers against him feel shame or repentance for their groundless calumnies. The most part probably plume themselves on their godly zeal, and will be as eager as ever to catch up the next calumny, and to join in the next agitation, that comes across their path.

I have referred to these painful events, because a person, unacquainted with the inflammable temper of the English religious mind, might deem himself warranted in inferring that, when such a ferment is spreading through the length and breadth of the land, with the clergy, who ought to be the inculcaters of temperance and sobermindedness and order and peace, taking the lead, there must needs be some valid, substantial ground for it. Whereas the instances cited prove that it may exist, with very little, if any, rational cause, and that, of all objects of fear, an imaginary one is the most terrific. Cases have indeed occurred, in which the attempt to undeceive a person under a strong delusion, has only strengthened it, and brought on a fatal crisis: still, though in dealing with individuals one may humour the

peculiarities of the patient, when one is writing for the Church, the only method is to declare the truth simply and nakedly. In the present instance, if one can but prevail on people to look at the real facts calmly and steadily, they will find that the passionate fear by which they have been borne along, has made them magnify and distort the object whereby it has been excited, so that a mere declaration of the law on a particular case is converted into a formidable, wilful assault on the primary doctrines of the Church.

Among the mischievous features belonging to these agitations, is the proneness to speak evil of dignities, and of all whom we regard as agents in the matters whereby we are provoked. Thus the excellent reformer of the Post-Office became the object of much abuse. Thus too the controversy with the Educational Committee of Council has been aggravated and inflamed by painful personalities. They whom we assume to be our enemies, are straightway regarded as the enemies of religion, or at least of the Church: and a like systematic enmity is perpetually imputed to the Government; although they have not shewn any indications of it, but have rather manifested a desire to conciliate the Church, and to help and strengthen her, as far as she will allow them. In the present case this spirit is venting itself in the most unwarrantable condemnation of the Judges, who have pronounced sentence in favour of Mr Gorham. It matters not that the five Judges who concurred in the sentence, are men of admirable legal ability, and exemplary in their judicial character, men on whose integrity one would contentedly stake one's fortune, or one's life: it matters not that they are supported by the two Primates of our Church: they are assailed with all manner of abuse; and the host of their

assailants is headed by a Bishop, who with characteristic propriety aims his fiercest blows at the Archbishop of his Province. So obstinate is our belief in our own infallibility, that we will rather charge these seven men of unblemisht, unimpeachable character with giving unrighteous judgement, than suspect the possibility of our being mistaken. They pondered the matter anxiously for months: their condemners, most of them, have scarcely spent ten minutes in weighing and balancing the arguments which make for the opposite sides: nay, many are thoroughly persuaded that there is no argument to be alledged against them: therefore, seeing that we are quite right, they must be utterly wrong; and, if their errour did not arise from want of understanding, which can hardly be imputed to men of such sagacity,—why, then it must have sprung from dishonesty. It goes for nothing, that hundreds of pious, conscientious, godly men, in generation after generation, have deemed that they could honestly interpret our Formularies in the sense which the Judges assign to them; though a modest man would surely regard this as a proof that there must be some speciousness in such an interpretation. No: all those men were utterly wrong; and the Judges too were utterly wrong; and everybody is utterly wrong, who dares to differ from us.

Yet, for my own part, at the time when the proceedings were going on, I was strongly imprest, even by the report in the newspaper, with the pains which the Judges took to gain a right apprehension of the arguments submitted to them: and one of my brother Archdeacons has written to me: "I was present during the whole hearing of the case; and it was impossible not to feel the highest admiration of the patience, earnestness, and strict equity, with which the Judges received every part of the

pleadings, as men pervaded with the one all-ruling desire of judging righteously on the matter before them." Mr Dodsworth too, though he expresses very strong disapprobation of the Judgement, says in his Pamphlet on the Gorham case: "Having been present during almost the whole of the argument,—I hope I may be permitted to bear my humble testimony to the unwearied patience, care, and application, with which those high functionaries fulfilled a difficult, and in some respects, as it must have been to them, a very irksome duty. Any one present—must have felt that nothing was wanting in this respect. Most unwearied pains appeared to be taken by all the Judges without exception to arrive at the meaning of terms and statements of doctrine, with which they were obviously not familiar."

I have cited these witnesses, not merely to vindicate those whose conduct has been so violently attackt, but also because hardly anything is so irritating as the notion that we are suffering a wrong. When we are convinced that a judgement is just, even though it be solely according to the letter of the law, we submit to it. In ordinary cases,—such is the well-merited, loyal confidence of Englishmen in the Judges of the land,—the voice of Law at once puts an end to strife. Or, if it be deemed requisite to procure a more distinct enunciation, or an alteration of the law, this is sought by constitutional methods, without any reproach to the Judges. Their discretion in *nisi prius* cases may of course be often questioned: but, when they pronounce collectively on an appeal, their interpretation of the law, according to its actual state, is acknowledged to be right. Why should we act otherwise now? Because Religion is concerned. But surely Religion herself inculcates obedience to the laws, reverence for all lawful authorities. Have those who

have been laying such stress on the exposition of Baptism in the Catechism, forgotten that the same Catechism gives a clear and simple account of our duty toward our neighbour, and that one main branch of it is, to honour and obey the Queen, and all who are put in authority under her? Or has the Catechism no claim to our deference and obedience, save when it treats of inscrutable mysteries, with regard to which it must needs be very difficult to attain to any absolute precision of language or thought? May we despise it, as though it were an old woman's rigmarole, when it speaks of plain practical duties, which all can understand, and all are called to fulfill?

I am not wishing to recommend servile submission in a case where truth is at stake. I am not claiming infallibility for our Judges, any more than for any other body of men. All may err; all have erred often; and the age of errour will not soon pass away. But if any mischief has been done to the Church by the recent Judgement, only let us cherish the conviction that it has not been done intentionally, wilfully, maliciously,—that they who gave the Judgement gave it under a conscientious purpose to judge according to right, according to the recognised principles and practice of our Law-courts, with no further bias than is always found in them, inclining them to protect the accused from any heavier penalties than the strict letter of the law imposes: let us be thoroughly persuaded of this, and at the same time dismiss all other bugbears of State-interference, and hostile governments, and secular tyranny; and not only will the peace of the Church return; but we shall have made considerable progress toward the attainment of a remedy.

When such counsels are given, one is sure to be told

that we are to obey God, rather than man; and a polemical zealot will cry out, that, as the Wisdom from above is declared to be *first pure*, and *then peaceable*, it is clear that we are not to cultivate peace, until we have obtained a recognition of the truth in its dogmatical purity and entireness. A more complete perversion of a divine text than this latter can hardly be found. *Purity*, in the verse of St James, like all the other characteristics there predicated of heavenly Wisdom, is evidently a moral quality, even as *peaceableness* is, and *gentleness*, and *mercy*, and *impartiality*. It does not require the cultivation of the intellect, but may be found in the babes, to whom the Gospel is revealed. According to the above-mentioned interpretation, this blessed verse would become the motto and watchword of the Inquisition, of all such as are set on extirpating whatever is opposed to their notions of dogmatical purity, and then, *ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant*. As to the declaration of the Apostles, that their obedience to God was of higher obligation than that to any human authority, there never was a case to which it was less applicable than to the present. For the human command, which they deemed themselves bound to disregard, was the prohibition to preach God's truth and salvation, as made manifest in His Son Jesus Christ. But the decision of the Court of Appeal no way trenches on the right of every minister of our Church to preach the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. It allows him the fullest liberty of doing so; and it admits by implication that his doctrine is that of our Church.

Had the sentence been the other way, then indeed the case would have been different. At present no one is prohibited from preaching what he believes to be the truth. We are merely precluded from expelling those

among our brethren who do not agree with us. We are precluded from using any other weapons against them than those of calm, reasonable persuasion. Surely we ought to give thanks that we are thus preserved from a temptation, which the contentiousness incident to theological controversies would have found it difficult to resist. We ought to give thanks, both in our own behalf and in behalf of our Bishops, that they are preserved from the temptation to erect an Inquisition in every Diocese. But, if the decision of the Court of Arches had been confirmed, then it would indeed have behoved that large body of our Clergy who participate more or less in Mr Gorham's opinions, to bear in mind that they were bound to obey God rather than man. Nor would they have been allowed to forget this. The spirit which has been manifested by many of their opponents on this occasion,—a sad counterpart of that which from the opposite side has for years been urging our Romanizing brethren to quit the Church of their Baptism,—proves that there would have been no lack of persons to remind them of this duty, nor even of those who, if hints were neglected, would gladly have called in the aid of the law. We may indeed feel assured that no other of our present Bishops would have followed the disastrous example set them in the Diocese of Exeter,—that most of them would rather have cast their mitres on the ground, than been the authors of such a terrible calamity to the Church. But still, while men's passions are blind, and their will obstinate, while Faith and Love have no place in so many hearts, the desire to tyrannize, the appetite for persecution, if they had found the means of gratification, would have made use of them, even in these days. An imperious Dogmatism would have lorded it over our Church. Faith and Godliness would have waxt

cold,—as is ever the case, by a judicial retribution, in a persecuting Church,—or would have fled away into the arms of Dissent.

That the view which I have taken in my Letter as to the bearings of the Judgement on the doctrine of our Church is correct, I cannot doubt. They who have been greatly disturbed by it, they who have been put into a fever of disappointment or anger, look upon it, as might be expected, in a different light; for it is the property of such feelings to exaggerate and distort their objects. Thus they charge it with impugning an Article of the Creed, although that Article was not set before the Court in the pleadings, nor even suggested until the closing paragraphs of the last Advocate's speech, and although it would have been utterly inconsistent with the principles and practice of our law to found a condemnation of Mr Gorham on the words of that Article. But this shifting of the ground of the case renders it better fitted to furnish matter for a popular outcry. *The Judges have been impugning an Article of the Creed! Therefore it behoves every sound Churchman to defend the Church from the effects of this wicked, heretical sentence.* These words are easily uttered, readily caught up: and who, when he feels his churchmanship boiling over with righteous indignation, will think of asking whether such is indeed the fact? The very doubt would betoken that there is a pernicious spirit of scepticism and infidelity lurking in his breast.

In like manner it is said with clamorous repetition that the Court of Appeal has been presuming to determine the doctrine of the Church. The Court itself indeed asserts the very contrary. It states, "The question which we have to decide is, not whether Mr Gorham's opinions are theologically sound or unsound,—not whether

upon some of the doctrines comprised in the opinions, other opinions opposite to them may or may not be held with equal, or even greater reason, by other learned and pious ministers of the Church; but whether these opinions now under consideration are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England, by its Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, requires to be held by its ministers; so that upon the ground of those opinions the Appellant can lawfully be excluded from the benefice to which he has been presented." Again they say, "It must be carefully borne in mind that the question, and the only question, for us to decide is, whether Mr Gorham's doctrine is contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law establisht.—If the doctrine of Mr Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law establisht, it cannot afford a legal ground for refusing him institution to the living to which he has been lawfully presented." The Judges seem to be thoroughly aware of their true position, and of the duties belonging to it. They urge reiteratedly that their business is not to determine doctrine, but to administer law; that they are to decide, not according to the doctrines of the Church generally, but according to those of the Church of England *as by law establisht*,—that the question before them is to ascertain whether there are *legal* grounds for refusing institution to a living, to which there has been a *lawful* presentation. One might have supposed that the lawyers who are placed on the judicial Bench, would probably have known something about their own craft. But no: it is the well-known practice in our Courts of Law, that the most ignorant lawyers are always placed on the Bench: and those who had to give judgement in this cause are notoriously the most ignorant

in the whole body of ignoramuses: and besides their personal character is such that no one of them was ever known to refuse the paltriest bribe; and they wanted to curry favour with the Government, and with the religious newspapers, and with the Primate: and each of them had secretly formed a plot to get the reversion of the Registrarship for the Province of Canterbury, with its uncurtailed twelve thousand a year, for his son, or for his niece's husband, or for his housemaid's brother . . . . . therefore, seeing that all these hindrances, intellectual and moral, incapacitated them for forming a right Judgement, we need not care what they say, and may interpret their words by contraries whenever it suits our purpose. When they say that they have no authority to determine doctrine, the real meaning of their words is, that they are just going to determine doctrine. When they talk about that which is legal and lawful, they are thinking all the while of doing that which is illegal and unlawful.

Yet Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, in laying down the rules for his own procedure, used nearly the same terms. "Now I would here state,—and I am particularly anxious to have it understood,—that I guard myself against being supposed to offer any opinion as to the disputed point of *Theology* between the parties. I am not going to pronounce an opinion as to whether unconditional Regeneration in the case of Infants is or is not a doctrine deducible from the Scriptures. It is no part of the duty of the Court, nor is it within its province, to institute any such enquiry as that. All that the Court is called upon to do,—and all that it can properly do, as coming within the limits of its authority,—is to endeavour to ascertain whether the Church has determined anything upon this subject; and, having so ascertained, to

pronounce accordingly. *The authoritative declaration of the Church* constitutes the law of this Court, to which it is bound to conform, and which it is incumbent upon it implicitly to follow; without indulging any speculative opinion of its own as to whether that declaration is founded in errour or in truth. The Court is to administer that law as it finds it laid down, and is not to give any opinion as to what the law ought to be. Therefore I desire to be distinctly understood, in the observations I am about to make, as confining my attention and directing my observations to the doctrine of the Church solely, so far as I am able to ascertain it; without any allusion to those passages of Holy Writ which are, or are supposed to be, applicable to the effects of Baptism on those to whom it is administered." Surely the distinction here laid down is perfectly clear and intelligible. Moreover Sir Herbert Jenner Fust's Judgement has been the object of high praise from the very persons who are the most vehement in condemning that of the Court of Appeal: nor have I heard of their raising any exception against it, on the score of its taking upon itself to determine doctrine. Such a strange difference does it make in the aspect of things, whether we look at them with favorable or unfavorable eyes. In the one case wrong becomes right; in the other right becomes wrong.

This view of the Judgement, resting, as it does, on the declarations of both the Courts, has been confirmed by everything I have heard or read or thought on the subject since: and it seems to me establisht irrefragably by what Lord Campbell says in his excellent letter to Miss Sellon: "I assure you that we have given no opinion contrary to yours on the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. We had no jurisdiction to decide any doctrinal question; and we studiously abstained from

doing so. We were only called upon to construe the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and to say whether they be so framed as to condemn certain opinions exprest by Mr Gorham." Surely the Chief Justice of England may be supposed to understand the nature and purport of the Judgement, which he himself has just been delivering,—at all events when his interpretation of it is confirmed by such men as the four Judges who concurred in it. The assailers of the Judgement may be much more learned men, much more clearheaded, much more intelligent and sagacious in all other matters; but on this one point at least the five Judges are likelier to be in the right. If this however be so, what plea is there for all this agitation and irritation. The Judgement does not sanction Mr Gorham's opinions. It does not declare them to be conformable to the general doctrine of our Church. All that it pronounces is, that the law of the Church, as collected from her symbolical books, does not so distinctly and peremptorily condemn that scheme of opinions, which it ascribes to Mr Gorham, as to exclude him from her ministry. This last consideration is of such importance, that I have laid great stress on it in my Letter. The qualified sanction implied in the Judgement does not extend to any opinions that Mr Gorham has exprest in the course of his Examination, except so far as they are comprised in the summary of them drawn up by the Court. If the cause had been conducted in a regular manner,—if definite issues had been joined, — if the particular passages in Mr Gorham's Book which the Bishop regarded as especially heretical, had been distinctly cited in the pleadings, and the judgement of the Court had been sought upon them,—it would have been recognised that the Judgement of the Court did not extend to any

passages beyond those thus set before them. In like manner,—though it may seem presumptuous for a clergyman to speak confidently on such a question,—I cannot believe,—and my conviction has been confirmed by high legal authority,—that the present Judgement embraces any other doctrines than those expressly stated therein. It would probably bar further proceedings against Mr Gorham on account of this same Book: but if he were to publish a volume tomorrow, reasserting all the opinions exprest in his Examination, I cannot doubt that he might be prosecuted for those opinions, except so far as they are specified in the present Judgement, and that it would be of no avail whatever to shield him from condemnation on account of them.

It has been argued indeed, that the distinction for which I have been contending, nay, for which both the Court of Appeal and the Court of Arches contend,—that they have not been determining the doctrine of the Church, but merely pronouncing a judicial sentence according to that doctrine as already determined by the Church,—is untenable. This proposition has been maintained at length and with much ingenuity by my dear Brother Archdeacon in his Speech at a Meeting of the Clergy held some six weeks ago at Chichester. Yet surely the distinction, as laid down in the two Judgements, especially in the earlier one, is very clear and intelligible. Surely there is a broad difference between the power which would belong to a legislative body, such as a Synod of the Church, and that which is committed to her Courts of Law. For instance, the former, while it felt itself bound by the principles of practical wisdom to pay great reverence to the existing laws and institutions, would nevertheless deem itself warranted and authorized, nay enjoined, should occasion arise for defining or

modifying any part of them, to seek counsel from the word of God, from history, from the decrees of Councils, and from the teaching of the greatest divines. On the other hand a Court of Law is obliged to regulate its decisions altogether by the existing Formularies of the Church. Even if the Judges individually should think the Formularies erroneous, they are compelled to pronounce sentence according to them. It is true, though the judicial province and the legislative are essentially distinct, there is a border-land between them, where they meet and run into each other; and this border-land may become injuriously extensive, when the body politic is not rightly developt, and the two powers do not exist in due coordination. But it is mostly a calamity, when the judicial power has to exercise the functions of the legislative; and still more certainly, when the legislative power usurps the functions of the judicial. A Synod properly constituted would be the fittest body to wield the legislative power: but the principles of justice would often be perverted and violated, if it were to assume the judicial.

Here I will take leave to explain a contradiction, which some persons, with no unfriendly purpose, have fancied they have perceived in my remarks on occasion of this unhappy controversy. I have exprest my conviction that our Church does assert the regeneration of every baptized infant, and my own belief that, under a right acceptation of the term, every baptized infant is indeed regenerate. I have further stated my persuasion that this is not a mere abstract proposition, but a truth of great practical moment for our Christian education and teaching. Nevertheless I have on the other hand exprest great satisfaction and thankfulness at the decision of the Court of Appeal in favour of

Mr Gorham. Now on this account, I would hope, no one will tax me with inconsistency. For surely the stronger our conviction of a truth is, the more shall we shrink from calling in a Court of Law to inculcate it. Even over the asses bridge one would not drive a man by Balaam's method: and he who tries to do so in the region of moral and spiritual truth, will find an angel with a drawn sword standing in the way.

But I have further said, in note K to my last Charge (p. 97), after making a like statement concerning the doctrine of our Church, that, "if we do not believe this, we cannot minister in her Baptismal Service, without a twofold delusion, without deceiving others and ourselves." These words, taken alone, may appear less easily reconcilable with an approval of the Judgement. But here also, when they are viewed in connexion with their purpose, the inconsistency will vanish. In the passage in which they stand, I was addressing the so-called Evangelical Clergy, while the judgement was still pending; and I urged them earnestly not to take any hasty steps, should the decision be against Mr Gorham. For I knew of many, and believed there were hundreds, if not thousands, of our best working Clergy, who would be grievously disturbed by such a decision, and who were looking forward to the necessity of resigning their cures; unless indeed the Judges had taken pains to limit their sentence to the peculiar form in which Mr Gorham had exprest his opinions. At the same time I felt it incumbent on me to avoid the slightest appearance of advising them to do that, which they could not do "with perfect conscientiousness, with singlehearted honour, with unequivocating, uncompromising truth." Hence, after stating what seemed to me necessarily implied in our Formularies, I added: "If we do not believe this, we

cannot minister in the Baptismal Service without a two-fold delusion, without deceiving others and ourselves." In these words I was appealing to their consciences: and when we speak to a person's conscience with regard to the present or the future, it behoves us to set forth the truth plainly, firmly, according to the strict letter of the law of Duty. It behoves us to say, *Thou art bound to do that which is purely, thoroughly right,—to refrain from that which has the slightest taint of wrong in it.* This is the rule which we ought to apply to our own conscience, and to set up for the guidance of others.

When however one is called to deal with an actual, individual case, and to pronounce sentence upon it, Mercy comes in, and ought to come in, to temper Judgement. The strictness of the general rule requires to be modified by a regard to the peculiar circumstances. No one will exercise the same severity in condemning a particular offender, as in condemning a vice generally. No reasonable man will make his own conscience the measure of his neighbour's. Hence, although I feel that, in my own case, with my own notions concerning the meaning of our Formularies, if I held the opinions concerning Baptism, which Mr Gorham has exprest in some of his answers, I could not conscientiously discharge the ministerial office in our Church, — and although, in speaking generally to others, on the natural assumption that my interpretation, if confirmed by the Judgement of both the Courts, was correct, I could not but declare that such opinions seemed to me incompatible with that office; yet I cannot deem myself warranted in condemning Mr Gorham, even by a private exercise of judgement, for acting otherwise; seeing that he, by certain logical processes, applied to a mystery which lies beyond the reach of strict reasoning, has been led to a different

conclusion. A person who has ever reflected on the innumerable varieties and diversities to be found in men's intellectual constitutions and habits, will be very slow to pronounce concerning any form of errour, that it cannot be entertained conscientiously. Doubtless Simeon Stylites deemed that he was doing what was right and well-pleasing to God.

In like manner, as we are bound to modify our general rule, before we pass judgement on any one, even within our own minds, equally great, if not still greater, modifications are indispensable, before we take any outward step in consequence of what we regard as contrary to that rule, thus setting up the law of Conscience as the law of a political or social body. How many offenses against morals are there, which, when speaking or writing as moral teachers, we are bound to condemn severely, but which, if we had to discharge a judicial or legislative function, we should hardly notice! The two codes are totally distinct. We do not condemn a man judicially, because he does not obey the law of Conscience, or that of Honour, but because he has offended against some determinate, positive law of the State, or of the Church. Among other important differences, a main one is, that the former laws look chiefly to that which is in the heart, the latter almost exclusively to the outward act,—a distinction of great importance in connexion with the present case. For if Mr Gorham had of his own accord publisht a book promulgating all the same opinions that he has exprest in his Examination,—or if evidence could be produced that he had preacht all the same doctrines in his Sermons,—then, as his act would have been overt and wilful, it seems to me that, if the case had been conducted with legal strictness, if the passages most repugnant to our Formularies had been adduced in the

pleadings, and definite issues had been joined on them, the result would probably have been different. Whereas, seeing that the subject matter of the charge against Mr Gorham was not any voluntary, independent act of his own, for which therefore he would justly have been responsible, but a series of answers wrung from him by a long, subtile, inquisitorial examination, the Judges, knowing how easily people may be driven in the course of an argument to assert propositions which they would never have thought of maintaining otherwise, rightly held that, when opinions thus extorted were brought before them as the ground for a severe judicial sentence, they had a claim to the utmost latitude of favorable construction. This is a consideration of great moment in estimating the character of the Judgement, both in its bearings on the doctrine of the Church, and in reference to the subject matter on which it was pronounced. Yet this consideration has been almost overlookt by those who have been so vehement in condemning the Judgement, in their eagerness to kick down and trample on whatever came athwart their prejudices and their wilfulness, even though it was invested with the majesty and sanctity of law.

Nor, if I may say so with all rightful deference, does it seem to me that sufficient weight was ascribed to this consideration in the Judgement of the Court of Arches: for which reason that Judgement, even if it was literally legal,—a question into which I have no call to enter,—could hardly be otherwise than morally unjust. For no due allowance was made for the very peculiar circumstances of the case; and Mr Gorham's expressions were treated as stringently as if they had been a wilful attack on the doctrine of the Church. This is a matter of great practical moment, in connexion with the rights of the

whole body of the inferior Clergy. For, even if there be a legal ground,—which, after the decision of the Court of Arches, I am not warranted in denying,—for the right assumed by the Bishop of Exeter to examine Mr Gorham previously to his institution, it can never have been intended that the right should be exercised in so inquisitorial a manner. Mr Badeley himself, in trying to vindicate this right, goes back to a Statute belonging to the age of Edward the Second, a reign in which, through the weakness of the soverein, ecclesiastical tyranny was allowed to encroach on the liberties of the Church: nor does it seem to have been exercised for centuries; so that it had become obsolete, and incongruous with the present condition of our Church; as incongruous as the Wager of Battel claimed some years ago was with the present condition of civil society. Hence one of the measures which ought to result from this calamitous controversy, and which is indeed indispensable for the pacification of the Church, is the abolition of this obsolete right. When a man is a candidate for orders, the Bishop has a right and is bound to examine him, for the sake of ascertaining whether he holds the faith of the Church, and is duly qualified for her ministry. But when he has once attained an ecclesiastical status, he should not be deprived of it, or of the rights pertaining to it, except on account of some overt, voluntary act. He becomes responsible for the opinions which he publishes or preaches, but not for those which he keeps in his own breast. To make him legally responsible for the latter violates the first principles of Justice, and is a crime which has only been committed by the worst tyrants, unless within the pale of the Church. If such a right were conceded to a prelate with the logical powers of the Bishop of Exeter, and who used them in the same manner, he would be able to

entangle three-fourths of the clergy, who came to him for institution, in sundry heretical propositions, whereby he might deprive them of their ecclesiastical rights; and thus he, who was set to be the father of his Diocese, would be apt to become its torment and curse. For these reasons I hope that, when the Church resumes her state of peace and order, the Statute of Edward II. will be abolisht, or at all events so limited and restricted, that the mischievous right conferred by it shall be precluded henceforward from bringing such dire calamities upon us.

Be this as it may, I trust I have shewn that it no way follows from a person's holding a determinate conviction, however strongly, on any subject,—nor even from his thinking that others ought to hold the same conviction, as he of course must if he deems it of importance,—that he should desire to enforce that conviction by civil or ecclesiastical penalties. Rather, if his conviction be deep and living, will he shrink from what can only repell both the understanding and the heart, and will rejoice at the removal of every penalty by which the attractive power of Truth is only hindered and obstructed. He will desire that she should no longer go forth attended by janizaries, who, while they compell men to bow to her, in fact keep them at a distance; but that she should pass freely, from mind to mind, and from heart to heart, winning them all by her own irresistible light and beauty. Had the recent Judgement been condemnatory of the hypothetical view of Baptismal Grace, it would assuredly have repelled many from the true doctrine, who have of late been approaching gradually toward it. At present, were it not for the irritation of this blind and blinding controversy, the Judgement itself would have inclined many to adopt a more conciliatory spirit.

As the Truth is to make us free, so must we be free from all human constraint in receiving it.

Through the darkness and dreariness of this grievous controversy, a hope has been dawning upon me, that in the end it may be overruled by God to the clearing up of confusions and to the healing of divisions in our Church. For generations the chief part of the dissensions by which her ministers have been agitated, have turned on this very point of Baptismal Regeneration. Seldom do a dozen Clergymen assemble at a Clerical Meeting, but some difference will arise concerning this very question. Now the conclusion which my observations have forced upon me, is, that these disputes are in great part owing to a certain ambiguity and indeterminateness in the use of the word *Regeneration*. By many on both sides it is interpreted as involving a complete change of nature. One may wonder that a person, who knows anything about children, should conceive that such a change can take place in them at their Baptism: but one cannot wonder that they who have a discernment and reverence for facts, should deny the Regeneration of children, when such a meaning is ascribed to it. Now, when a dispute arises from the ambiguity of a term, the natural remedy is to define that term. Such a process however must not in this instance be carried too far; else those who hold strong views on each side might be offended and excluded. It is enough if we shew that the meaning, which has occasioned the controversy, is not necessarily implied in the term. The course adopted by the Bishop of Exeter could only drive Mr Gorham into more determined opposition. But let it be declared that Regeneration is the initiation into the Christian life, not, as by some it is represented, the angelic consummation of that life,—that it is the primary incorporation into the Body of Christ,

which ought to be followed by a continual, progressive assimilation therewith,—that, though we are brought by it into a state of salvation, we need the constant help of the Holy Spirit to keep and advance in that state. It has long seemed to me that a simple, clear, authoritative exposition on this point would quiet many troubled consciences, and put an end to many disputes: and the time for such an exposition would seem to be now come. We must not allow of any decision, by which the great body of our Evangelical Clergy would be driven out of the ministry. But on the other hand it is desirable that those who are persuaded, however erroneously, that the doctrine of our Church is materially corrupted by the recent Judgement, should be deprived of such a plea for leaving us. They too, who, while they continue faithful in their allegiance to their spiritual Mother, are grievously disturbed by a sentence, which they regard as repugnant to our Formularies, deserve the tenderest consideration. Let neither party be sacrificed to the other. Let us endeavour to keep both within the fold, to reconcile and unite both. This has mostly been the wisdom of the rulers of our Church, except in that calamitous period which followed the Restoration, when they indulged their bitterest animosities, and revenged themselves on their adversaries, sacrificing the peace and well-being of the Church to the gratification of their vengeance.

The hope that something may be effected in this way to allay and heal the differences in our Church, has been brightening before me almost daily during the month since the publication of my Letter. For I have been involved by it in a correspondence with a number of persons on both sides, several of them taking very strong views: yet they have all strengthened my belief, that, if a judicious, authoritative statement as to the meaning of

the word Regeneration could be drawn up, corresponding in some measure to the suggestions in pp. 37, 38, the two parties, which are now standing in hostile array against each other, will discern that their opposition is far greater in word than in reality: and the main part of those, whose understandings are not fevered by passion, or palsied by bigotry, will be ready to adopt an explanation, which will reunite them to their brethren, and relieve them from the necessity of straining the language of one portion of our symbolical books, to bring it into conformity with their view of the meaning of the other part.

Thus, for instance, on the one hand, Professor Scholefield, in his able, well reasoned sermon *On Baptismal Regeneration*, after asking, "Is the Baptism of the infant a mere sign, of no value or power, and bringing with it no blessing? and does the blessing begin, not from the time of his Baptism, but only from the time of its visible development, in the framing of his life, and moulding of his character in conformity to the will of God?" replies (p. 15), "Nay, we doubt not that it is the doctrine of our Church, and a doctrine according to truth, that, as in the covenant then sealed God engages to bestow the grace of life, so He does bestow an earnest of it at the time,—a measure of that mysterious power and unction, with which the Baptist was *filled even from his mother's womb;* — a tender seed it may be, and not to be discerned by the eye of man, but yet the beginning of spiritual life, which, strengthened by Christian instruction, and watered by Christian prayers, gradually ripens with the expanding mind, and bears fruit at last unto life eternal." And four pages after he says that, if it be contended, "that the guilt of original sin is thereby washt away,—as the inestimable value of this blessing is disputed by none, so neither is it doubted by any that

it is conveyed and sealed in Baptism. Nor again do any question that, as a consequence, baptized children, *dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.*"

On the other hand, the necessity of Conversion, as an act subsequent to infant Baptism, independent of Regeneration, and posterior to it, is inculcated almost as strongly in the last volume of Archdeacon Manning's Sermons, as by any so-called Evangelical preacher.

Now, when there is such an approximation between the opposite parties in our Church, why should it not become still closer in the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace? Nay, but, with God's blessing, it shall do so. The Bishop of Exeter has done all that one man could do to rend our Church in twain. Mr Dodsworth, in his Sermon on *A House divided against itself*, has drawn the extraordinary conclusion from our Lord's declaration concerning such a House, that, whereas the opposite parties have hitherto been permitted to coexist within the pale of our Church, this must now no longer be allowed,—in effect, that half the house must be pulled down as the best way of strengthening the other half. But, under God's blessing, we will not suffer the authors and preachers of division to domineer in our Church. Let them talk of indifference, of latitudinarianism, of what not,—with God's blessing we will still seek peace and ensue it.

When we turn to Dr Pusey's work, which I have cited above, we breathe a different atmosphere. It has been a great pleasure to me to find him approving of the remedial measure which I have suggested in my Letter, and have just been speaking of. He is quite right in assuming that, when I spoke of the necessity of Conversion, I did not mean to express any approval of the delusive notion, which has been a source of so much

perplexity and distress to earnest seekers after righteousness, that it is necessary for every Christian to be conscious of a determinate, sudden change, whereby his heart was turned to God. Indeed, at the very time when I was writing my Letter, I happened to preach a Sermon of warning against this noxious delusion, shewing that, though the sudden Conversion of Saul is an example sometimes followed in God's dealings with His servants, His ordinary dealings with them are rather exemplified by the gradual growth in grace, with occasional backslidings, seen in the lives of the other Apostles. Nevertheless we both acknowledge that, in consequence of the power of the world over those who have been regenerated in Baptism, it is necessary in almost every case,—if we should not rather say in every case,—that there should be a change, more or less evident, a conversion, more or less gradual, by which the old man shall be turned into the new man, the carnal heart into the spiritual.

At the end of his Volume (p. 258), Dr Pusey has drawn up a statement, "in words taken from Hooker, Bishop Davenant, and St Augustin," which he proposes as an exposition of the meaning of Baptismal Regeneration: "By the Sacrament of Baptism all infants are incorporated into Christ, and through His most precious merits receive remission of original sin, as also that infused Divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition toward future newness of life. Yet this regenerating grace, although sufficient for their salvation, as infants, doth not suffice for them as adults, unless through the continual grace of God they with their whole hearts turn to the Lord their God, and cleave to Him, and abide in that conversion to Him unto the end." This statement, as Dr Pusey himself says, requires to be "maturely

weighed by a Conference of those who long for union in the Church." I will not enter upon a critical examination and discussion of it here, but will merely say that in the main I should heartily approve of it, and that, from its similarity to the statement which I have cited above from Professor Scholefield's Sermon, we may reasonably believe that, possibly with some slight modifications, it would satisfy the chief part of those who cannot recognise the universality of Baptismal Regeneration, from attaching a different sense to the term. Should this be so, the present controversy, which looks so threatening, would indeed be brought to a blessed issue: and our Church, which now hath sorrow in her travail, would no more remember her anguish, for joy that such peace was born into the world.

Such a statement, if it is to be authoritative, must emanate from a Synod of our Church; and if we were to meet in Synod for such a purpose, God's blessing would assuredly rest upon us. Let us make it manifest that our hearts are earnestly set upon promoting true peace in the Church, not by exclusion, but by comprehension; and we may trust that He will stir the hearts of our secular Rulers to allow us to meet in Convocation, if not in a better constituted Synod.

For the present we may feel thankful to our Bishops for the Bill which they have brought forward to remedy the objectionable features in the present constitution of the Court of Appeal. In the Note to my Charge I have already observed, that, it is only through accident and inadvertence, in consequence of the rarity of trials for heresy, that the decision of cases, in which doctrine is concerned, appertains to the present Court of Appeal. Hence the Government are not urged by any so-called point of honour to resist the Episcopal Bill: and surely,

as a matter of principle, it is right and just that the decision on questions of doctrine should not be committed to laymen, who are no way conversant therewith, but, mainly at least, to the chief pastors of the Church, the appointed Guardians of her faith, with the aid, if needful, of some of her Professors of Divinity. Nor can we well doubt that the lay Judges themselves would be thankful to be relieved from their present irksome and distressing task, which can only subject them to reproach from one side or the other.

It will indeed be necessary to adopt all possible precautions, lest the interpretation of the doctrine of our Formularies committed to the Episcopal Tribunal should lapse into new determinations of doctrine. For such a Court would be much apter to fall into this errour, than one composed of lay Judges; both from the personal interest which each Bishop would feel in the doctrine he was called to pronounce on, and from their not having been trained, as Judges are, to distinguish between the law as it is, and as they may conceive it ought to be. The observance of the distinction between the judicial function and the legislative would be more difficult, when the question propounded concerned doctrine only: and since much weight would be attacht to their decision by the Church, we should be liable to have fresh determinations of doctrine on the sole authority of a majority of the existing Bench of Bishops at any time; without the corrective force of the inferior Clergy in the Lower House of Convocation,—or of the Lay members of the Church, who, it begins now to be generally acknowledged, ought to have their place in a rightly constituted Synod,—or even of the Crown, acting as their representative and protector, by giving or withholding its sanction to the proceedings. These difficulties however,

if the Law-lords will concur with the Bishops in adapting the Bill to the exigencies of our present condition, may doubtless be overcome. Nor does it seem unreasonable to hope that, if such a Bill holds out a prospect of allaying the deplorable agitation in our Church, the Government will thankfully do what they can to pass it.

Hitherto, in this Postscript, my dear Cavendish, I have dropt my personal address to you; for I was writing on matters in which, though they arose out of my Letter, you were not directly concerned. But, as you have found it necessary to publish an answer to my Letter, —a trouble I had no intention of imposing on you,— I cannot conclude without thanking you heartily for the very kind and affectionate spirit which pervades it. In this respect it is everything I could have wisht, and just what I expected from you.

Of course however I could have wisht,—though I can hardly say I expected,—that my Letter should have produced some little effect upon your opinions with regard to the present crisis in our Church,—that it should not, as far as relates to you, have been so utterly vain and futile. To me, I own, it seemed, that the irrelevance, the inconsecutiveness, the inconclusiveness of your Resolutions had been fully demonstrated in my Letter,— that they had been shewn to be grounded on a misapprehension of the Judgement which they impugned, and therefore, even if they had been of any worth as abstract propositions, to be inapplicable to the present condition of our Church. Hence I could not but feel regret on reading your declaration (p. 6), that you would still "be prepared to sign them at this moment, had

you not already done so." The meeting with such a difference, nay, a pertinacious contrariety of opinion on questions so plain and simple as the chief part of those treated in my Letter, — in which I purposely avoided matters of doctrine, and tried to confine myself to matters of fact, and to the plain meaning of a few plain words,—the finding that on points, which to me seem clear, a friend, the fashion of whose mind has in some degree been modified by mine, and who has every inclination to listen to me with favorable attention, can only see black where I see white, even after some weeks of reflexion on the arguments placed before him, —would almost discourage one from attempting to act upon any person by means of words, and would make one fancy that to build up a pile of reasoning is scarcely a more profitable task than to roll up the stone of Sisyphus, which *αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα πεδόνδε κυλίνδετο.* But at all events we ought to learn one lesson from this fact,—a lesson of great price always, and especially so for our present discussion, — that, when such obstinate differences exist between two persons, in whom one might reasonably look for agreement, it must be the wildest of all dreams to fancy that, notwithstanding the innumerable diversities of men's minds, aggravated as those diversities are by the multitudinous combinations of their circumstances, all shall be brought to an agreement on a number of the most obscure, profound, intricate, complicated propositions. This has often been urged before, by no one more eloquently, or, considering the age when he lived, more conclusively, than by Jeremy Taylor, in the invaluable Dedication of his *Liberty of Prophesying*, which contains golden words of wisdom well fitted to guide us aright in the bewildering controversies of our times.

It is contended indeed that the charitable allowance of diversities of opinion does not rightly apply to matters which belong to the Faith; and this you also maintain. Doubtless there are limits to it in this respect. There are certain primary, fundamental truths, which are essential parts of Christianity, of the Revelation which God vouchsafed to manifest in the Incarnation and Sacrifice of His Only-begotten Son, — truths, without the recognition of which it is impossible to be a Christian at all, and which are at once light and life, which by their light kindle and foster life, and by their living power awaken and expand the understanding,—in other words, which are of Faith. The confession of a certain number of these truths, the Church has from the first ages declared to be indispensable, before any person can become a member of the Body of Christ. A somewhat fuller statement of nearly the same truths, she drew up to be the Rule of Faith for those who had become members of that Body. With these for centuries she was content. Her subsequent Confessions, whether medieval, or belonging to the age of the Reformation, were in the main negative, drawn up to exclude errours wherewith the Faith had been corrupted, through the speculative, systematizing, dogmatical tendencies of the human mind. Hence these pertain rather to theologians than to the common people. The Church too herself was at times infected and misled by the dogmatical, systematizing spirit, which led many of her members into errours branded with the name of heresies, as we see especially in the Canons of the Council of Trent. Few things shew the wisdom of our Reformers more clearly, than the contrast between our Articles and those Canons, and the comparison of them with the great body of the Protestant Confessions. That which has lately been

made the ground of reproach against our Church, the scantiness of her dogmatical teaching, is rather one of her peculiar, Providential blessings. Our Reformers discerned that the business of a Church is not to lay down a system of Dogmatical Theology, but to bring her members to Christ, and to train them up in His knowledge and fellowship, merely setting her mark of exclusion on those errours of doctrine and practice, which would draw them away from that spiritual communion.

But I must not pursue these remarks, which would soon lead me into a long discussion, and which I have merely introduced here, because he who asserts a neglected, disputed truth in these days, is almost sure to be accused of disparaging, if not denying, its opposite or complementary truth. Of course, when any branch of the Church, whether following the general voice of antiquity, or acting on its own independent authority according to the exigencies of a particular age, lays down any propositions explicitly and absolutely, they must be deemed binding on the consciences of its ministers. As the Church is not infallible, it may admit of question whether her conduct in laying down certain propositions imperatively has been wise and expedient: but, when they are so laid down, their obligatoriness cannot be disputed. He who cannot conscientiously accept them, must not seek to enter her ministry. In order however to their being thus obligatory, it is necessary that they should be exprest so distinctly, and fully, as to leave no room for doubt: and this is above all indispensable, when their obligatoriness is to be enforced by a Court of Law.

This brings me to the main point of controversy between us. You and your co-protesters have asserted that the recent Judgement impugns the Article of the Nicene

Creed, in which we declare our belief in one Baptism for the Remission of Sins: and your assertion has been repeated in vociferous cries from one end of England to the other. This assertion I have denied in my Letter. I have denied the fact. I have shewn in the first part of this Postscript, how it was only at the last hour, when every other argument was exhausted, that Mr Badeley hit upon one, which nobody had hit on before, and thus gave a solemn emphasis to his peroration. He, as an Advocate, was quite justified in doing so: but this fact in itself is a strong presumptive proof that there was nothing in the argument to which a Court of Law could attend. A Judge cannot pass a sentence of condemnation on the strength of that which is said to be implied in a law: he must be guided solely by that which is expressly declared in it. To act otherwise would violate all rules of justice. He cannot defer even to the known purpose of the lawgiver, but merely to that which he has exprest. The known purpose of the lawgiver might indeed be used in some degree to mitigate the severity of a law, but not to enhance it. Even though it were known that every Bishop at Nicaea had in his private capacity declared that Original Sin is remitted in the Baptismal Act, this would not have been sufficient to prove that the remission is legally involved in the Article of the Creed. Mr Badeley's complaint that the Judges gave no heed to his argument on this point is of a piece with the rest of his hasty, intemperate Preface. They could hardly have noticed it, unless by shewing its irrelevance; and this, as so little stress had been laid on it in the proceedings, they had no special obligation to do. But if they could not allow this argument to influence their decision, their decision cannot rightly be said to impugn that Article.

Even Dr Pusey, though he still maintains that the Article is contravened in the Judgement,—allowing at the same time that this was done in ignorance,—cannot extract this contravention from the Judgement itself. He tries indeed (in p. 248) to construct such a contravention, and to attach it to the Judgement. "The Judicial Committee (he says) kept themselves as clear from laying down heresy, as they could, consistently with acquitting it.—They state as Mr Gorham's doctrine, 'that in no case [neither of adults nor infants] is regeneration in Baptism unconditional;' that the Articles do not determine what is signified by 'right reception;' that Mr Gorham says, 'in the case of infants, it is with God's grace and favour.' Of course it is. But this—would be *nihil ad rem*, unless it meant that *some* infants brought to Baptism were *not* in God's 'grace and favour;' and such a statement again would have no bearing upon that of 'right reception,' without Mr Gorham's theory that 'infants are by nature *un*worthy recipients, being born in sin and the children of wrath;' and so original sin, which the Church has ever believed to be remitted by the Sacrament of Baptism, is to be an obstacle to its 'right reception,' unless it have been previously remitted by God's grace and favour."

Blackstone, after giving an account of the Statute of Edward the Third on high Treason, says, "Sir Matthew Hale is very high in his encomiums on the great wisdom and care of the Parliament, in thus keeping Judges within the proper bounds and limits of this Act, by not suffering them to run out (upon their own opinions) into constructive treasons, though in cases that seem to them to have a like parity of reason, but reserving them to the decision of Parliament. This is a great security to the public, the Judges, and even this sacred Act itself; and

leaves a weighty memento to Judges to be careful and not over-hasty in letting in treasons by construction or interpretation, especially in new cases that have not been resolved and settled. He observes, that, as the authoritative decision of these *casus omissi* is reserved to the King and Parliament, the most regular way to do it is by a new declarative Act: and therefore the opinion of any one, or of both Houses, though of very respectable weight, is not that solemn declaration referred to by this Act, as the only criterion for judging of future treasons." How exactly do all these observations apply to that which in the ecclesiastical law has been regarded as the counterpart of treason, heresy! How important is it, that similar and equal caution be exercised, before "new cases, that have not been resolved and settled," are declared to be heretical! How dangerous would it be to truth and freedom, if any man, even such a man as Dr Pusey, were allowed to condemn a person for constructive heresies! There is no heresy, no contradiction to the Creed, in the words which Dr Pusey quotes from the Judgement. But, as on the one side he inserts a number of additional determinations into the Article of the Creed, which are not exprest or indicated by its words, so here he foists in divers clauses into the Judgement, of which there is no hint in it; and thus by a twofold construction he produces a contradiction between them. It no way follows by any logical necessity from the assertion that a right reception in the case of infants lies in God's grace and favour, that *some* infants brought to Baptism are *not* in God's grace and favour. For all may be so. Indeed the very act by which a child is brought to be baptized, is an eminent proof of God's grace and favour, as he himself would assuredly grant, and as is implied throughout the Epistles, where the

Apostles speak of those who are called. I am not saying that this is Mr Gorham's meaning; but it is a meaning which the words cited from the Judgement may legitimately bear; and therefore they cannot legally be pronounced heretical. Wherever a sound meaning can be deduced from the words, the law will not presume an unsound one. Hence, I remarkt above, the only answer which Dr Pusey's reply to my Letter seemed to me to require, was a repetition of the assertion that the Judgement is a legal act, of Judges sitting to declare what the law of the Church is, or rather whether a certain person for a certain act has incurred a sentence of deprivation by that law. They did not sit to determine generally what the doctrine of our Church is, still less what it ought to be: and therefore Dr Pusey's citations from the Fathers concerning the Remission of Sins do not bear upon the Judgement, any more than a large portion of Mr Badeley's speech, which he complains that the Judges took no notice of, but which, however valuable it might be in a doctrinal controversy, was of no force in a judicial one.

Indeed I cannot see how it can be legally maintained that there is any essential reference whatsoever to Original Sin in the Article of the Creed. Dr Pusey (in p. 246) would foist the same train of consequences into the Apostles Creed. He finds the oak in the acorn. Yet a boy who pickt up an acorn, would hardly be condemned by a Court of Law, even one composed of doctors of divinity, for carrying off an oak. Surely a Pelagian might with perfect good faith profess his belief in the Forgiveness of Sins, and even in one Baptism for the Remission of Sins. Learned doctors may pronounce that these words involve a long series of consequences; but, unless these are manifestly implied in the words, a

legal tribunal cannot enforce them, till they have an express sanction from some ulterior decree of the Church: in which case the contravention would be, not to the Article of the Creed, but to that subsequent decree.

You too, my dear Friend, seem to be still under the influence of this same misapprehension, which, I believe, is the main cause of the difference between us. Thus, after referring to a series of arguments which I had adduced to shew that the Judgement was a legal act, and that, as such, it had been, and could not but be pronounced in conformity to the principles generally recognised in the administration of our laws, you tell me (p. 11), that "such a way of argument leaves out of view the most sacred interests of the congregations entrusted to the care of Mr Gorham, and those who agree with him." But, however important this consideration may be, the Judges had nothing to do with it, and could not take it into account, without violating the principles of our jurisprudence. As their business was not to determine doctrine, neither was it to enquire and decide what was for the good of Mr Gorham's parishioners, but,—I am forced to repeat the assertion over and over again,—solely whether there were legal grounds why he should not be instituted to a living, to which he had been lawfully presented. You ask me (p. 12), whether it would not be too bad, if the Lord Chancellor were to impose an able scholar, who laboured under the delusion that it was an act of virtue to break one of the commandments, as a tutor on a ward of Chancery. Again, in p. 14, you say, in reference "to the statement that the purpose of the suit was to visit Mr Gorham with a civil penalty," that "no one would consider it a civil penalty to refuse the office of cook to an estimable and skilful person, whom

—he knew to hold—the opinion that arsenic is a most agreeable and wholesome condiment." This latter comparison has been quoted in a review of your Pamphlet, as though it settled the question. Yet,—not to speak of the manner in which you here stigmatize Mr Gorham's opinions, and which is no less unworthy of you than of him,—both your comparisons just blink that which is the main point in the argument. Neither the law-breaking tutor, nor the poison-loving cook has any legal claim to the proposed office. He who engages either is free to exercise his own option. Mr Gorham, on the other hand, had a legal claim to be instituted, and could not be rejected, except on account of some adequate legal disqualification. If the Bishop had been the patron of the living, then your parallels might have held water: but then, for whatsoever motive he might have refused to present A or B to the living, even though it had been for their having, or not having red hair, no suit could have been brought against him.

This misapprehension, which lay at the bottom of your manifesto, and which seems to me to run through your Answer to my Letter, has also run through the main part of what has been written against the Judgement. The Judges are reproacht by the selfsame persons, at one moment for having presumed to determine the doctrine of our Church, and the next moment because, under the conviction that they had merely to determine a question of law, they did not enter sufficiently into the examination of doctrine. Surely however a misapprehension of this kind on so plain a matter cannot last for ever. May I not still hope, my dear Friend, that even you will at length open your eyes and see through it? To be sure this cannot happen, so long as you call the Bishop of Exeter's Letter to the Archbishop

"unanswerable" (p. 6), and Mr Badeley's Preface "equally unanswerable." As to the latter, it is not likely that any one will think it worth while to expose the hasty, groundless assertions contained in it. But so far is the Bishop's Letter from being "unanswerable," that it has received a very able answer from Mr Goode,—which perhaps has caught too much of its tone, as was scarcely avoidable,—but which at all events has thoroughly demolisht the chief part of its assertions and arguments. Surely ere long the soberminded members of our Church will recognise the justice of what the Bishop of Glocester has said, in his Reply to an Address from the Laity of his Diocese: "I am inclined to hope that the late Judgement of the Court of Appeal will not produce any practical effect,—beyond that which we must all lament,—the excitement in the minds of Churchmen, and a state of uneasiness which militates against peace, unity, and concord. This at least is certain,—the doctrine of the Church respecting Infant Baptism remains the same as it was before that Judgement was pronounced."

To a like effect the Bishop of Salisbury says in his Reply to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Wells: "Whatever be the effect of the decision of the Court in the particular case submitted to it, the doctrine of the Church remains written as before in the Articles, Catechism, and Liturgical Formularies; and these speak in such express terms of the Remission of Sins by spiritual Regeneration in the case of all infants duly brought to Baptism, that I feel assured that even the present unhappy controversy will in the end but the more firmly establish the truth, which appears to be placed in peril. In the mean time may we have grace given to us, in holding the truth and speaking the truth, to do so in

love. Let us bear in mind that differences on this subject are not unfrequently apparent, rather than real, arising, not from an actual denial of the gift of God's grace in Baptism, but from a different mode of defining Regeneration as a theological term. And knowing that some, who are reluctant to use the expression *Baptismal Regeneration*, are influenced by the erroneous idea that this doctrine tends to the denial of the great truths of the necessity of the Conversion by the grace of God of those who are living in sin, and of the actual renewal by the Holy Spirit of the will and affections of all, let us ever be careful so to speak, as to prove that no occasion can rightly be given for so injurious an imputation." The same view of the Judgement is taken by the Bishop of Lichfield, who, in a similar Reply, says that he trusts, the teaching of the Church concerning Baptism "will be no ways affected by the late Judgement of the Committee of Privy Council." Indeed the great majority of our Bishops seem to concur in this opinion; since their late Conference has not led to any measures with a view of counteracting any injury done to the doctrinal statements of our Formularies. I have also had much pleasure in reading an excellent letter by Archdeacon Churton in *the Guardian* of the 8th of May, whose views, though taken from a different point, coincide in the main with those exprest in this Letter.

With such encouragements to hope that this correcter apprehension of the character of the recent Judgement, when confirmed by such authority, will ere long quiet the extravagant agitation which has been so grievously disturbing our Church, I should here conclude, but that I have observed two expressions in the earlier part of your Letter, which are such plausible fallacies, that I doubt not they have exercised a good deal of power,

not only in warping your judgement on this question, but that of many others also.

In p. 8, you tell me, that, "in assigning the reasons for my thankfulness" on account of the Judgement, I "avowedly rest my satisfaction simply and solely on a ground of expediency." Very true, my dear Cavendish: I do so. Nor do I know what other ground to take in estimating the worth of the Judgement, when its legality has been establisht. I rejoice in it, because I am firmly persuaded that it is greatly for the good of Christ's Church in this land, and because it has preserved us from terrible evils which threatened us. There is a fallacy in the use of this word *expediency*, which I have had to point out more than once, in connexion with measures of public utility, when the opponents of those measures have bolstered up their prejudices by the notion that they were contending for principles, against the advocates of a paltry expediency.

Now thus far I would heartily concur with you, in condemning all so-called systems of morals, which profess to deduce the principles of morality from a consideration of general consequences,—which stifle Conscience, and dethrone Duty, and bid a man look solely to that which is expedient. For, though that which is expedient for the human race at large, will coincide ultimately with that which is according to the dictates of Conscience and Duty,—seeing that Godliness has the promise of this world also,—yet it is an inversion of the proper, simple, natural course, to draw the water of life from the measureless ocean of general consequences, instead of from the fountain springing up within the heart: and there are woful tendencies to biass the judgement in the calculation of that which is so incalculable, tendencies

which need to be represt by the severe and solemn voice of the moral Law from within.

But the moment we proceed from the principles of morality to realize them in any outward act, whereby others are to be affected, it immediately becomes necessary to take account of the effect which is likely to be produced upon others: and this must ever be a question of expediency. We all feel this in every relation of life, even in the most familiar, to the members of our own family, to our servants, especially to children. In our dealings with others we do not regulate our conduct by a hard, lifeless, Stoical, categorical imperative. The office of practical wisdom is ever to determine the point of union between the law from within and the good of the persons on whom we are to act. This is no compromise of the law, no sacrifice of it to expediency. It is the carrying out of that divine principle of Christian Ethics, that Love is the fulfilment of the Law. It is the principle on which St Paul ever acted, and which he continually lays down and inculcates, when he speaks of our relative duties. Nay, it is the principle which our Lord Himself, He Himself the Truth and the Life, the perfect Incarnation of Divine Love, set before us by His example, when He spake the word to the people in parables, *as they were able to hear it.* This rule He thus laid down for the guidance of His Church; but the Church, under the sway of dogmatical self-will, has frequently sinned against it.

In the present case, as in all others, the duty of the Church is to place the truth before the people, *as they are able to hear it.* There is no divine voice commanding us, *Ye must compell your ministers to believe,—or at all events to say that they believe,— in the universal, unconditional regeneration of all baptized infants; else*

ye must cast them out of the ministry. If any such voice is heard, it comes not from God, but from him who mocks the voice of God, that he may bring ruin and desolation on His Church. The voice of Conscience does indeed command us to preach those truths, the knowledge of which has been vouchsafed to us; although even with regard to this, our own individual act, some attention is due to expediency, to the good which our preaching is likely to effect. He who rejects such considerations stands on the verge of madness. Hence is it so needful that the Church should be endowed with the wisdom of the serpent, as well as with the simplicity and harmlessness of the dove: mark the word, my dear Friend, with harmlessness, with the harmlessness of the dove. We are to preach the truth ourselves, according to the measure of it which has been granted to us, and with a due regard to times and seasons; but it is no part of our commission to make others preach the selfsame truth. Rather, as we desire and claim that the rights of our own conscience should be respected, so let us learn to respect the rights of conscience in our brethren. Or, if there must be persecution, if there must be oppression on either side, let it be our desire and prayer to be on the side of the persecuted and opprest, rather than on that of the persecutors and oppressors. Let us desire this, even on the ground of expediency, for the good of our Church; because no Church has ever grown or thriven by inflicting, but only by suffering persecution. Let us desire it, that we may obtain the blessings which our Lord has promist to those who endure persecution for His sake. Let us desire it, because hereby we shall be likened to the Son of Man Himself, whose Church, after the example of her Lord, even now cannot pass, except through much tribulation, into glory.

This brings me to the second passage, on which I wish to add a few words. You not only condemn my motive for rejoicing at the Judgement on the ground of expediency; but you add (p. 9):—"For persons who appreciate the gravity and importance of this Judgement, to be deterred from the course which they feel it to be their duty to pursue by any such considerations as induce you to rejoice in it, would be, in very truth, the grossest breach of charity which they could commit. For what, if in their tenderness toward clergymen who have sought Holy Orders in the English Church, and continue to hold their preferments, although they cannot use the Baptismal Services except in a non-natural sense, they should altogether overlook the effect of the necessary teaching of such pastors on their flocks? If it be true that there is such a thing as one Faith once delivered to the Saints, as we believe, and that the Church of England would be giving up part of that Faith if she should submit to the recent Judgement, how can we be indifferent whether or not that Faith be taught 'whole and undefiled' to the poor of Christ's Church? Surely, if there be any one plain Christian duty more binding than another on the rulers of the Church, it is to take jealous care that persons, the character of whose faith must so materially depend on the oral teaching of the Church, should not be robbed of any portion of their Christian privileges. To overlook their eternal interests out of regard to the comfort and happiness of any number of clergymen, however excellent and devoted to their duties, would be morbid sentimentality."

My dear Friend, I wish from my heart you had not written this last sentence. The speciousness in it is gained by a mere sophism. For, instead of overlooking the eternal interests of the congregations, out of regard

to the comfort and happiness of the so-called Evangelical Clergy, it is for the sake of the congregations, quite as much as for that of the Clergy, that I rejoice that the shepherds have not been torn away from their sheep, before whom they go, and who follow them, because they know their voice. The pastors who would have been driven out of the ministry if the Judgement of the Court of Arches had been confirmed, would have comprised a very large proportion of the best, the godliest, the most faithful and devoted in the whole compass of our Church, those who have exercised, and are exercising the most salutary influence on their people. That my estimate of the number who would have been thus affected, is not exaggerated, but the contrary, I have been assured from divers quarters, among other persons by some of the highest dignitaries in our Church. The schism would have been, as often before in the history of Christ's Church, as more than once in that of our own Church, between subjective Faith, so to say, and objective Faith, between that Faith which yearns after a living union with Christ, and the living graces of His Spirit, and that which is made up of a system of dogmas and ordinances. Doubtless on your side also there are holy, saintly men: the very names attacht to your manifesto prove this. Doubtless there are several amongst them whose teaching exercises a powerful and salutary influence, especially over the higher classes. But for "the poor of Christ's Church," whom you select as the chief objects of your solicitude, lest they should be "robbed of any portion of their Christian privileges," all my observation, and all the information I have received from others, combine in persuading me, that the preaching and teaching which lead them to a lively apprehension of the power of Christ's death, and of the Redemption He has wrought for them,

and to seeking humbly and fervently after a living communion with Him, are to be found in far larger proportions among those who rejoice with thankfulness at the late Judgement, than among those who are exciting such an opposition against it. They who are slow to recognise the adoption whereby we become children of God, except in those in whom they see some evident fruits of the Spirit, would seem, as a body, to be more diligent in endeavouring to cultivate those fruits, than they who believe that the adoption has already taken place at Baptism. Therefore it was not for the Clergy, apart from their congregations, but along with their congregations, that I pleaded so earnestly in my Letter. I did not weigh the eternal interests of the latter, against the comfort and happiness of the former, because I knew that they were identical, or at least wrapt up in each other.

But even if this had not been the case, if that large body of our Evangelical Clergy, who would have been driven out of the Ministry by a Judgement peremptorily condemning the conditional or hypothetical view of Baptismal Regeneration, had not comprised so large a proportion of our most efficient pastors, still I cannot think without deep pain that you should call a regard to the comfort and happiness of a number of excellent men, devoted to their ministerial duties, "morbid sentimentality." Surely, my dear Friend, these words bear no mark of the spirit of Him who, when He saw the multitude a-hungred, had compassion upon them, and wrought a miracle to feed them. He did not look with scorn even on our least sufferings or sorrows. It is said that some of the fiercest persecutors had been men of a gentle, tender, loving nature, until the withering spirit of dogmatical bigotry dried up the sources of feeling,

and made them fancy that the blood of heretics was an offering acceptable to God. Even in these days too I have seen indications in men of noble and gentle characters that such an awful transformation is not impossible; wherefore it is necessary to keep watch against the first approaches of such a mind. When we have once taken that dismal downward step, to confound the living Faith, whereby the heart and soul and mind are to be united to God in His Son, with the mere intellectual reception of a certain number of dogmatical propositions, then, — inasmuch as our Conscience is ever telling us that there is no moral worth in the mere intellectual reception of any truths,—we may easily lapse, as the Church of Rome has perpetually, into the superstitious notion, that the mere outward acknowledgement of those truths with the lips will have a saving power. Thus intellectual errour becomes an object of fiercer hatred than the very worst crimes, and is stampt with the name of heresy, even when it is pure from all taint of that moral perversity, which in the Apostolic times formed the main evil of heresy.

You, my Friend, call it "morbid sentimentality," to feel any deep interest in the comfort and happiness of a large body of excellent, zealous clergymen, who hold an erroneous view concerning Baptismal Regeneration. You do indeed introduce a saving clause: in comparison with the eternal interests of their flocks. But this is the very self-delusion by which persecutors blind themselves. They tell themselves that they are contending for the eternal interests of those who might have been deceived by the heretics. Yet, though you wrote sincerely, and were not aware that you were deceiving yourself, surely you cannot mean that the congregations under the care of our Evangelical Clergy are in greater peril of

condemnation, are worse fed with the word of God, worse supplied with the waters of life, than the average of our congregations. In a subsequent passage (pp. 15, 16), you speak as if the efficiency of our preaching rested mainly on our having the authority of the Church to lean on. But it is not so. The preachers who have stirred the heart and roused the conscience, who have convinced men of sin and of righteousness and of judgement, have not gone to the dogmas of the Church for the sources of their doctrine, but to the word of God, and have drawn copiously from its living waters, whereto mankind may come, and draw from its exhaustless fountains, as long as the world endures. Nor have "great learning and ability," as you seem to imply, anything to do with the power of the preacher, especially over the poor. As Leighton beautifully says, in his Sermon on the Parable of the Sower, portraying what he himself fulfilled, "He is the fittest to preach, who is himself most like his message, and comes forth, not only with a handful of seed in his hand, but with store of it in his heart, the word *dwelling in him richly*."

You indeed disclaim all persecution: you say (p. 11), that you "know of no persons who would not deprecate the infliction of civil penalties, in the cause of religion, as earnestly as I myself should." In saying this, I have no doubt, you are perfectly sincere. Yet in the passage before quoted you call it "morbid sentimentality" to feel anxious about "the comfort and happiness" of a number of excellent clergymen. Have you realized to yourself what you mean by their "comfort and happiness?" The words would seem to imply that you were thinking about their having to give up their preferment, to quit their parsonages, their comfortable homes, their happy parochial lives, the most blessed mode of life

perhaps that has ever been vouchsafed to man. Now even this, when falling upon husbands and fathers, upon their wives and children, would be a grievous calamity; and the infliction of such a calamity on good and holy men, for no sin, no fault on their part, would be a cruel persecution. Think of such a fate befalling any friend of your own, any near relation: would you deem it morbid sentimentality to deplore his calamity? In one's own case one should desire to endure the loss patiently and submissively: but one should hardly even wish to do so in the case of a friend or relation: in his case one should do all one could lawfully to avert or remedy it. But in the case we are considering there would be still bitterer ingredients. There would be the severance of those holy ties, by which the loving pastor is bound to his loving people. There would be the compulsory exclusion from a work, to which in the fulness of his heart and soul, he had consecrated his whole life. Is it "morbid sentimentality" to mourn over such losses, to shrink from the thought of their befalling good and holy men? O may one never be healthy, if this is morbid!

You seem indeed half to imply that they have brought this evil upon themselves, "by seeking orders in our Church, and continuing to hold their preferments, although they could not use the Baptismal Services except in a non-natural sense." But, when they sought orders, they did so with perfect conscientiousness. They knew, as we all do, that for near a century the best, most pious, most active and faithful of our Clergy had held the same opinions concerning Baptism, without any authoritative reproof; that at one time there were very few faithful and active ministers who did not hold these opinions. Therefore usage justified them in looking upon

this as one of the questions which our Church has not peremptorily decided: and, though I cannot enter into a discussion on the point here, you may see from Mr Goode's very able Review of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust's Judgement, and from his Letter to the Bishop of Exeter, as well as from Mr Turner's masterly Speech before the Privy Council, that a very strong case may be made out in their favour, a far stronger than I had imagined. Accordingly, if it was to be determined by the ruling body in our Church, under whatsoever form, that the latitude which had so long been allowed in the interpretation of the Baptismal Service, and which had been the source of so much blessing to it, should henceforward be abridged, it would surely have behoved the Church to provide that the enforcement of this strictness should only take place gradually, and that the large number of godly men, who entered her ministry with thorough conscientiousness, and who have been discharging its duties faithfully and diligently, should not be rooted up at one earthquake-shock from the places where they have been growing as trees of life in the garden of the Lord. This would not have been "morbid sentimentality," but nothing more than a due regard to justice and honour, qualities which dogmatical bigotry will often violate unscrupulously.

Here I have great pleasure in strengthening my argument by a beautiful passage from Dr Pusey's Letter on the Supremacy. "We had been content that the question should not be raised. We felt that the evils and confusions of the Church did not lie in her mere present neglect of discipline; nor could they be remedied by any sudden restoration of it. The evil and the remedy lie far deeper. The evil was the neglect and lukewarmness of the last century; the remedy, *not by might*,

nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts. We felt and had seen with our eyes, that God's Holy Spirit was working through our whole Church; and we waited patiently until He should, as the Church prays continually, 'lead all into the way of truth,' that 'they should hold the Faith in unity of Spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.' Meantime there is nothing (which is not of faith) more certain, than that good men, even amid partial errour of understanding, or amid invincible prejudice, believe far more truly than they speak, or dare even to own to themselves. And the hope of the Church is, not in any being severed from her, even though they do not yet believe all which she teaches; but that God would open their minds, as He has the minds and hearts of so many, to the full reception of His truth. Better, for the time, that uncertain and perplexing language should be used, even by some of the priests, whose *mouths* should *keep knowledge*, than that souls should be led to part from the Church itself, the Body of Christ, the Sacraments, and the very hope of being led into the full truth."

From these words one might have hoped that Dr Pusey would have greatly deplored and deprecated the act by which this disaster seemed so likely to be forced upon our Church; nay, that he would almost have been thankful for the Judgement, by which for the present it has been averted; more especially as he recognises so amply (in pp. 5—9), that "a judicial decision, even of the highest Court, cannot affect the doctrine of the Church of England: the plain meaning of her Formularies must be the same. The Judgement could affect discipline only." And the sudden restoration of this, he had said, "could not remedy our present evils and confusions."

When the ministers of Charles the Tenth in 1830 made

their attack on the Press, Niebuhr said, that they had burst the talisman which held the demon of the Revolution in chains. In like manner has the Bishop of Exeter burst the talisman which bound the evil spirit of Schism, in our Church. Parties holding widely different opinions existed in it side by side. Such has always been the case, and always must be, while men's minds and hearts retain their strong, determined, limited individuality. On divers points these differences had been exasperated into decided opposition, through a variety of causes, operating during three centuries,—to some of which Dr Pusey has alluded, as you too yourself have in p. 28, — through errours on both sides, through misconduct on both sides, but far more culpable on that of the High Church party, whose lifeless doctrine was mostly used chiefly to suppress and stifle living faith. In such a state of things what was the course of Wisdom? even of human Wisdom? not to speak of that which would have become a Bishop of Christ's Church. When opposite opinions are held honestly and conscientiously, Wisdom will trace them up to the point of their divergence, and shew how this is also the point of their coincidence. This would indeed be a remedial, healing process. On the other hand the course adopted by the pseudo-catholic Church has usually been to chop off every ramifying opinion: and thus, instead of a branching tree, bearing all manner of fruit and all manner of leaves for the healing of the nations, it sets up a naked pole, much like that which in these latter days by a like misnomer is termed a Tree of Liberty.

From this arbitrary, tyrannical course, we have been preserved by the Judgement of the Court of Appeal: and therefore do I rejoice and give thanks for it. A number of persons, who entered the ministry of our Church in

godly earnestness, who were not forbidden, but encouraged to do so by all our best Bishops, and whose faithful labours have for near a century been the chief means of blessing to her people, cannot now be driven out of her. In an extreme case of a wilful denial of her doctrine, discipline, I doubt not, might still be enforced by law. But the Inquisition shall not establish its tribunals in our Church; and for this we may well give thanks to God, and to the Judges who have preserved us from it.

The only efficient means of spreading the Faith, the word of God in its whole fulness, and the exercise of all our gifts upon it under the guidance of the Spirit,—the means by which the Apostles spread the Faith, the only means by which it has been spread ever since,—remain to us. Let the Wisdom from above reign in our Church, let it reign in the hearts of our Bishops, with all its divine attributes, *pure, and peaceable, and gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy;* and the truth will be acknowledged in its twofold power, as light and life. But the wisdom which exhibits the direct contraries to all these attributes, will never benefit the Church, however fiercely it may fight for dogmas, with the sword, the rack, or the stake.

Before I conclude, since you express yourself grieved by my having spoken of your Resolutions as likely to encourage persons in going to Rome, I feel bound to add, that, after reading over the paragraph in which I have said this, when I think what your Manifesto declared and threatened concerning our Church, I cannot conscientiously retract or modify a single expression in it. I have not said that this was your purpose: I have only said that this must needs be the effect of your Resolutions. They who reject considerations of expediency, in their zeal to proclaim what they believe, may tell me that they

had nothing to do with the consequences of their act. They said what they believed, and thus delivered their souls. To me, with my strong persuasion that it is a primary duty of Wisdom to observe times and seasons, and with the conviction,—which I deemed demonstrated, and which everything since has confirmed,— that your representation of the evils and dangers besetting our Church was enormously exaggerated, the Manifesto could not but seem a disloyal and unfilial act. It was an act of private judgement, whereby a knot of persons, some of them very eminent, but invested with no manner of authority, took upon themselves peremptorily to condemn the highest authorities, spiritual and judicial, in our Church. You indeed repudiate the imputation of private judgement; yet it is assuredly quite as much such an act to take upon oneself to interpret the doctrine of the Church in opposition to her constituted authorities, as to take upon oneself to interpret the Bible in like manner. There may be necessities justifying both these acts: indeed the latter is often a paramount duty: still such they are. Nor can I see anything short of extreme imprudence, in a denunciation that the Church, unless it adopted the measure which you prescribed, would forfeit her Christian privileges and power, in proclaiming this at a time when so many of our younger Clergy, through the erroneous teaching they have been subject to during the last fifteen years, have been so grievously disturbed in their allegiance to their spiritual Mother, and so deluded by fantastical notions of an unreal, nominal Catholicity, that they are ready to let slip the substance in grasping after the shadow, and have learnt to prize dogmas and ordinances above Christian faith and a Christian life. Should my anticipations prove erroneous, should your act be the means of keeping our

brethren in the Church, which you have represented to be in such imminent peril of extinction,—however I may be perplext to discover the relation between the cause and the effect,—I shall at all events be very thankful for the latter.

There are several other points in your Answer, about which I would gladly talk to you. But I must not prolong this overgrown Postscript. They may perhaps furnish matter for quiet discussion the next time we have the pleasure of seeing you at Herstmonceux.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. C. Hare.

May 27th, 1850.

The success of the Episcopal Bill to secure that the doctrines of the Church shall not be interpreted, except by a rightly constituted Tribunal, is of such moment for the sake of peace, that I will add a remark here, in connexion with what I have said on the subject in p. 78. In the Bishop of Salisbury's reply to an Address from his Clergy, he says, speaking of this Bill: "It commits the decision of points of doctrine to the judgement of those, to whom, in virtue of their sacred office, this function especially appertains, and who, we may hope, will, under the guidance of divine grace, pronounce their sentence *in careful conformity to God's holy word, as the sole and sufficient standard of revealed truth*, and in accordance with the Creeds and Articles and Liturgy of the Church, as its safe and authoritative expositors." Now the words printed in italics seem to me to prove the great probability of the danger pointed out in p. 78, and the great need of guarding against it. I have no doubt that my honoured Friend would agree with me that the

sole business of a Court of Appeal should be to decide what is the true meaning of our Formularies. But in that case the decision ought to be drawn exclusively from the words of the Formularies, elucidated, when necessary, by their history, not from the word of God in the Scriptures; which, if it is taken into account, immediately becomes paramount, as we perceive by the Bishop's expressions concerning it. Both the Courts saw this clearly, as I have shewn in pp. 59—62: yet a Bishop, unless he exercises the utmost watchfulness, can hardly speak on the subject, without being led by his love and reverence for the Bible to overlook this most important consideration.

The following are the Resolutions discust in the foregoing Letter.

1. That whatever at the present time be the force of the sentence delivered on appeal in the case of "Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter," the Church of England will eventually be bound by the said sentence, unless it shall openly and expressly reject the erroneous doctrine sanctioned thereby.

2. That the remission of original sin to all infants in, and by the grace of, baptism is an essential part of the article, "One baptism for the remission of sins."

3. That—to omit other questions raised by the said sentence—such sentence, while it does not deny the liberty of holding that article in the sense heretofore received, does equally sanction the assertion that original sin is a bar to the right reception of baptism, and is not remitted except when God bestows regeneration beforehand by an act of prevenient grace (whereof Holy Scripture and the Church are wholly silent), thereby rendering the benefits of holy baptism altogether uncertain and precarious.

4. That to admit the lawfulness of holding an exposition of an article of the creed contradictory of the essential meaning of that article is, in truth and in fact, to abandon that article.

5. That, inasmuch as the faith is one, and rests upon one principle of authority, the conscious, deliberate, and wilful abandonment of the essential meaning of an article of the creed destroys the divine foundation upon which alone the entire faith is propounded by the Church.

6. That any portion of the Church which does so abandon the essential meaning of an article of the creed forfeits not only the Catholic doctrine in that article, but also the office and authority to witness and teach as a member of the universal Church.

7. That by such conscious, wilful, and deliberate act such portion of the Church becomes formally separated from the Catholic body, and can no longer assure to its members the grace of the sacraments and the remission of sins.

8. That all measures consistent with the present legal position of the Church ought to be taken without delay to obtain an authoritative declaration by the Church of the doctrine of holy baptism impugned by the recent sentence; as, for instance, by praying license for the Church in Convocation to declare that doctrine, or by obtaining an act of Parliament to give legal effect to the decisions of the collective Episcopate on this and all other matters purely spiritual.

9. That, failing such measures, all efforts must be made to obtain from the said Episcopate, acting only in its spiritual character, a reaffirmation of the doctrine of holy baptism impugned by the said sentence.

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley and Henry Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

A FEW WORDS

ON THE

REJECTION OF THE EPISCOPAL BILL TO AMEND THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURT OF APPEAL.

1850.

A FEW WORDS ON THE REJECTION OF THE EPISCOPAL BILL.

In the Debate on the Second Reading of the Episcopal Bill for remodeling the Court for Ecclesiastical Appeals, the Bishop of Oxford, according to the report in *the Times*, closed his speech with a solemn warning to the House of Lords, lest, by rejecting the Bill, they should drive many of the best sons of our Church into schism. The Report, it is plain, gives a very imperfect representation of a speech, which has been described to me, by a man of severe judgement, as a torrent of the most brilliant eloquence, and in which the gifted Prelate must have been inspired beyond his wont by an almost overpowering conflux of feelings. Still one cannot well doubt that the main purport of what he said has been correctly exprest, and that in many passages we have his very words; as, for instance, where he tells the Lords, that, "if they refused to give a second reading to the Bill, they would alienate from the Church of England hearts without whose affection that Church would be weakened and emasculated." From this and other like expressions it is clear, that the eloquent Prelate, as an eloquent man is ever apt to do, and as a person under his strong emotions could hardly escape

doing, greatly exaggerated the consequences of the decision. For, under God's blessing, we may confidently trust, that, though among those who may be hovering on the brink of schism, there may be some of the brightest ornaments of our Church, yet the great body, ninety-nine hundredths, of our faithful, godly ministers would continue firm in their loyalty to their spiritual Mother; while of the laity I cannot think that we are likely to lose more than a few, and those chiefly women in the higher classes. On these grounds, when I have been told that certain persons have of late been brooding over a plan of following the example of the Free Church of Scotland, by seceding from the Establisht Church, and forming a free Episcopal Church in England, this plan has seemed to me altogether visionary. For, not to speak of the insuperable constitutional difficulties which beset a plan for erecting a schismatical Episcopate, the movement in England is not a national one, like that in Scotland, but confined in the main, so far as I can judge, to a portion of the Clergy, who, if they tried to set up by themselves, would mostly find themselves without a congregation.

Nevertheless I cannot but fear that the Bishop of Oxford's prognostications are not wholly groundless. I am afraid that there are persons,—how many I cannot even guess,—whose allegiance to our Church has already been so grievously shaken by divers causes during the last twenty years, that they only hang to it by a few threads, which a single blow, or even an inward recoil, may snap. It is a strange state of things, a most morbid, feverish state, a strange issue of what was called a Catholic movement, a strange reaction from what was meant to overthrow all private judgement. Such is the judicial constitution of

the moral world. When men set themselves up to strive against the true, divinely appointed order of things, they find themselves before long hurried into the very extremes of that against which they had been contending. We who desire to maintain our footing calmly and steadily in the station where God has placed us, see them drifting by us, first one way, and then the opposite way, according as the wind changes.

In this diseased state of men's minds, in which any casualty may precipitate a crisis, even the rejection of the Episcopal Bill may to some give the fatal impulse, which will drive them from the arms of their spiritual Mother . . . to whom? To whom can a son betake himself, when he flies from his Mother? To whom shall he fly from her? He who flies from his Mother's arms, is too likely to betake himself to the arms of a harlot. For what has his Mother done, that he should fly from her? What is she doing, that can drive any dutiful child from her? What is there in the rejection of this Bill, that should produce this effect? At all events it is not her act. If it be indeed wrong, it is not her wrong. She would not be doing the wrong, but suffering it. In such a case her loving sons will cling to her with an increase of love. They will not fly from her, because she is weak, because she is opprest. In this respect, it seems to me, the Bishop of Oxford, in his eagerness to win his immediate point, has somewhat indiscreetly overstated his case, and thereby furnisht a plea to those who are thinking of leaving us. He speaks, unless the Report greatly misrepresents him, as though the rejection of the Bill was almost to be a reason, why they, who are hesitating about quitting the Church, should take the decisive

step, and go out from us. He dissuades them indeed from doing so; but the great stress he lays on this argument would seem to imply that there is some real force in it. Now, according to the turn which the Debate took, I would earnestly contend, the adoption or rejection of the Bill ought not to weigh a single straw in the scale of those who are pondering whether they shall rush into schism or no.

For what is there, that can be regarded as in any way justifying a person in abandoning the Church of his Baptism? the Church by whom he was grafted into the body of Christ, and who has nourisht and brought him up as her child, and has fed him with the milk of the word, and with the sacramental Body and Blood of her divine Lord? What, I mean, unless he should be brought to the terrible conviction that she is not, and never has been a true Church; which cannot be the case with those whose abiding with her is said in any degree to depend on the recent vote in the House of Lords. Surely it cannot be anything less than a deliberate act of her own, by which she denies some essential part of the Faith, or at all events deliberately sanctions such a denial, or gives up some essential principle. There is no need to consider in what extreme cases such an act might justify a man's leaving her. It is enough for the present argument to assume, what will hardly be disputed, that nothing short of such an act can supply a reasonable cause for any one to say, *I, who from my baptism upward have been a faithful son of the English Church, whom God placed in her, and has bred up in her, can no longer continue to be so, can no longer serve her, no longer love her, but must join the host of her enemies.* He who divorces himself

from her must be able to alledge some determinate act of hers, which compells him to do so. His apostasy must be preceded by hers. Now in the debate on Monday night nothing of the kind was at stake,—no point of faith whatsoever, nothing like an essential principle. The question at issue was, what is the best constitution for the Court which is to try Ecclesiastical Appeals? and this question, as then treated, is altogether one of practical policy.

It may indeed be contended,—for it has been so,—that the Court of Appeal ought to be constituted, not by the Civil Legislature, but by an Ecclesiastical Synod, and that no tribunal can exercise a legitimate authority in pronouncing on the doctrines of the Church, unless it derives that authority from herself. This might be deemed a question of important principle: only they who maintain this, take up a position which historically is wholly untenable; and their errour is as though they would bring a ghost to a banquet, where no seat is left for him. The Ecclesiastical Court should indeed be constituted by the Church, as coincident and identical with the Christian Nation and State, and declaring its will through the organ of its Government and Legislature. The notion that it must be constituted by a Convocation of the Clergy, is refuted by history. There are difficulties indeed arising from the changes in the constitution of our Legislature, which is no longer exclusively formed by members of our Church. But these difficulties spring necessarily from the divided condition of the English nation, from the prevalence of Dissent and Schism: nor are they greater or more insuperable in this respect, than in all our other relations with the State. So long as our Church

continues the National Church,—so long as the State recognises and maintains its union with the Church,—for instance, in the Coronation of the Soverein by our Primate in our Cathedral and according to our ritual, in its daily prayers, in the reception of our Bishops into the Legislature, above all in investing us with the religious instruction of every Parish in the land,—we are bound to each other by reciprocal duties. Should Dissent advance so far, that the great body of the Nation, and the State as its representative, cast off their allegiance to the Church,—then we shall be on a level with all the dissenting bodies, and may act by ourselves, for ourselves. At present it is idle to complain that, while every dissenting body is allowed to act for itself, we are subject to the interference and controll of the Legislature. We are so for this very reason, that we are the National Church. A man brought up in civilized society cannot walk about naked, like a savage; but this is not a ground for complaint. In like manner every privilege has its own correlative obligations, which impose some fresh restraint on the licence of the lawless will. Were the State indeed to violate the compact with the Church, by attempting to alter her Formularies without duly consulting the persons who represent her spiritual authority, then it would behove us to resist such tyranny, even, as the Apostle admonishes us, *unto blood*. But in all ecclesiastical matters the State is no less bound to maintain the rights of the secular body, than those of the spiritual. It is bound also to take care, in matters of doctrine, that the Articles of Faith adopted by the National Church shall not undergo alteration or addition, except by the concurrent voice of our whole Church. If these considerations are duly attended to, we

shall find no difficulty in seeing through the fallacious objections which Mr Newman in his Lectures is now urging against our National Church, taking his stand upon that bare, formal Catholicism, which has ever denied the rights of each particular nation, as it has those of the individual conscience, and unable to comprehend that living universality, which is the fulness of Him who is All in all.

At all events, whatever this position might otherwise be, it has been abandoned in the very act of bringing the Episcopal Bill before the Legislature. That act implies that the Legislature has a right to reject, as well as to accept the Bill. They who consented, even tacitly, that it should be brought before Parliament, and who would have remained in the Church, if it had been adopted, cannot alledge that they are forced to leave the Church because it has been rejected. We cannot recognise a jurisdiction, with a proviso that we shall repudiate it, unless it decides according to our desires.

At least the only case in which such conduct could have been reconcilable with reason, would have been if it had appeared from the debate, that the Legislature had resolved, in the imperiousness of its absolute will, to maintain an improperly constituted tribunal, which a peculiar combination of circumstances imposed a few years ago on our Church, without any purpose of injuring her. It might in that case have been right that they who feel a deep interest in her freedom and spiritual well-being, should take counsel together whether the time were not come, when, for the sake of truth and righteousness, the Church would be constrained to cast off those bonds, with which her union to the State has fettered her. Happily

however no considerations of this kind are involved in the discussion. The gist of the Debate, when stript of that which was merely accidental and occasional, was, whether the modification of the Court of Appeal proposed by the Episcopal Bill was likely to promote the good administration of our Ecclesiastical Law, and the welfare of the Church generally. Now this is a simply practical question, and was treated as such by all the speakers, with the exception of the Bishop of Oxford; whose speech, according to the Report, passes over the practical discussion concerning the expediency of the proposed change, and mounts into the region of grand principles, whence it is difficult to discern the bearings of the immediate subject.

I have not overlookt that the Bishop of London is represented as protesting, at the close of his excellent and very judicious speech, "against the inference that he put out of view the fundamental and vital principle of the question, the indefeasible, inherent right of the Bishops of the Church of England to determine finally all questions of doctrine." But it is quite impossible that he could have meant, that there is any inherent, indefeasible right, by which the Bench of Bishops must needs form the only legitimate Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal, or rather, according to his proposition, the only legitimate Court of Reference with regard to all doctrinal questions. He cannot have meant to assert, as an inherent, indefeasible right, what is contradicted by the whole history of our Church, and of the whole Church,—nay, by the Bills which he himself has brought in year after year, for modifying the Court of Appeal. Nor is there any need that we should enquire and canvass what he may have meant by this protest.

The real question at issue was, whether the plan proposed by the Bishop of London, in unison with the main part of his Brethren, for referring questions of doctrine, occurring in Ecclesiastical Appeals, to the determination of the Bench of Bishops, is the most expedient mode of removing what is objectionable in the present constitution of the Court of Appeal. The thanks of the Church are due to him for the wise speech with which, under very heavy difficulties, he introduced his plan. Yet I think it is impossible to read the debate which followed, attentively and candidly, without perceiving that the plan itself is very far from a judicious one, and that, if it had been adopted, it might have occasioned incalculable mischief. In the Postscript to my Letter on the recent Judgement, I have indeed myself pleaded in behalf of this Bill (p. 78), from a desire that something might be done to allay the woful agitation in our Church, and from a wish to support the measure recommended by the general consent of our Bishops. Yet, even when I wrote that passage, a fortnight ago, I saw how very difficult it would be for Bishops, when consulted on a question of doctrine, to restrict themselves to a simple legal statement of that which is laid down in our Formularies; and I pointed out how indispensable it was that care should be taken to obviate this tendency. My scruples on this point were much strengthened, when I read that paragraph in the Bishop of Salisbury's Answer to his Clergy, which I have quoted in the last page of my Postscript. They have been strengthened still more by the Bishop of Oxford's speech. It would seem as though it would have been almost impossible to confine a body of Bishops to the mere legal interpretation of our Formularies.

But assuredly it would be very dangerous for the Church, to be thus liable to have new determinations of doctrine imposed upon her continually by a mere majority of the existing Bench of Bishops. Far safer would it be to leave the interpretation of our doctrines to the present Court, which, from the legal habits of its members, would know much better where to check itself. The danger I speak of is not such as any one party in the Church has more reason than another to fear. All would be equally threatened, some at one time, some at another; and it would rest with the Minister of the day to trim the balance, or to throw his weight into whatever scale he favoured. by his new appointments. For, as was remarkt by the Bishop of St. David's. though the members of the new Court might personally, most of them, be averse to such conflicts, they would not be able to repress the fiercer spirits who are ever to be found in a large body, and who would delight, when they had an opportunity, to gain decisions confirmatory of their own opinions, and condemnatory of their opponents.

Other great practical evils, which would almost infallibly result from the adoption of the proposed Court, were pointed out forcibly in the course of the debate,—especially those which would fall on the Court itself,—the divisions among the Bishops, the condemnation of one portion of them by the other, the odium which each party would incur with one or other half of the Church. No attempt was made to answer these objections, unless indeed the argumentative part of the Bishop of Oxford's speech has been entirely omitted in the Report. Yet these evils are inherent in the whole plan. Others that were urged, might have been removed in some measure.

had the Bill been committed. The difficulties about the Supremacy, on which great stress was laid, with little reason, as it seems to me, might easily have been got over, if there was any real force in them. But the evils inherent in the very constitution of the Court could hardly have been effectually remedied: and it was on the strength of these that the Bill was rejected. How then can its rejection afford a plea for the most captious mind, which will but look steadily at the facts of the case, to desert our Church?

Indeed, if I may allowably speak of my own opinion on this matter, notwithstanding the earnest desire which I have long felt to see the Church delivered from her subjection to a Supreme Court, no way qualified, and never intended, to pronounce upon her doctrines,—a desire which I have exprest in the Notes to my Charge for 1848, as well as to that for 1849,—and notwithstanding my yearnings for the peace of the Church, which have dictated all I have written on these controversies,—I do not see how I could myself have voted for the Episcopal Bill, had I been called to do so. I know not how, in such a case, I could have acted differently from my honoured friend, the Bishop of St David's. At least I should have felt the same pain, which he expresses, at being unable to support a measure drawn up for such an excellent purpose by the great body of our Bishops; and my reluctance to oppose them on such an occasion would probably have determined me to abstain, as he did, from voting altogether.

Of course however I should not have adopted my friend's line of conduct, if I had thought him liable to the severe censures which the Bishop of Oxford casts

upon him, in accusing him of having said, if not expressly, at least by implication, "that there is no such thing as truth, but that truth is what every man troweth, and that no man has a right to say that another is wrong;" and again, of "seeming to cast away altogether to the winds the awful responsibility which had been imprest upon him, when he was set apart to be one of the governors of the Church, and one of the trustees of its doctrines." But on the very face of these accusations it is quite clear that no Bishop in sound mind could have committed such a wanton outrage against decency, or said what would at once have given a death-blow to his character; and I can confidently assert, on the strength of an intimacy of forty years, that he, who is charged with speaking thus insanely, did not so speak. The Bishop of Oxford, under the intense agitation of the debate, must have totally misapprehended him. In such a matter a Report in a newspaper is a very inadequate guide. Still, when we find the Bishop of St David's concluding by saying, that, "it was quite impossible with his present convictions to share with his right reverend brethren the responsibility of a measure, which, in his conscience he believed, so far from remedying, was likely greatly to multiply and aggravate the dangers and difficulties of the Church,"—while it is manifest that the Reporter has here caught the real purport of his words,—we at once see that he did say something about a responsibility which he was unwilling to incur, the responsibility of a measure which he was persuaded would greatly multiply and aggravate the dangers and difficulties of the Church,—and that this reluctance is something very different from what the Bishop of Oxford imputes to him, a seeming to cast to the winds the

awful responsibility which was imprest upon him at his consecration.

As to the words spoken by the Bishop of St David's, which can in any way have supplied an occasion for his right reverend Brother's first accusation, the Report in *the Times* does not give us any clue. But having myself had to bear like censure from those who have no notion of truth, except as what they themselves trow, nor any notion that a man can love truth, unless he would force all other men to trow what he does, I can easily conceive that my Friend might say something whereby he might expose himself to a similar condemnation. Yet, if a life devoted to the constant, unwearied pursuit of truth under its manifold forms is evidence of a person's believing in the reality of that which he is thus seeking, few men in our days have given such proof, as the Bishop of St David's, that they believe, not only that there is such a thing as truth, but also that it is the most precious of all things. Nor is any man living less likely to assume that truth is what his neighbour troweth ; even as no man has taken greater pains in purging his mind from the almost universal delusion, that truth is what he himself troweth.

This apology for my honoured Friend is indeed a digression from my argument: but such accusations, if they gain credit, are destructive to a man's character, especially to that of a Bishop ; and one cannot doubt that the Bishop of Oxford will be thankful for being led to retract what he has said thus severely of his right reverend Brother. It may be that the Report in *the Times* has somewhat sharpened the sting of his words: only in that case one should have expected that he would

have sent some explanation of them to that Journal, to counteract the effect of a misrepresentation so injurious to his Brother's character.

To return to the point from which I digress,—if the House of Lords, in rejecting the Episcopal Bill, had manifested an imperious determination to reject the just claims of the Church,—if there had been any indications of a purpose to oppress her and trample upon her, to pervert her doctrines, or to violate her spiritual rights,—then indeed we should have been called to consider what measures were to be taken for maintaining the purity of the Faith. But seeing that the main question at issue in the debate was the practical expediency of the proposed tribunal, and that such strong arguments were urged to shew that it would be practically inexpedient and mischievous,—which arguments were left almost unanswered,—we ought rather to be thankful than indignant at a decision, which was dictated by a desire to promote the good of the Church, and to preserve her from the evil consequences of a proposition, unsupported by precedents, and devised somewhat hastily, on the spur of a particular occasion, at a moment of much agitation and distress. On this account has occasional legislation, legislation to remedy a particular grievance, ever been deprecated by wise statesmen. For, when we are under the immediate pressure of a grievance, our desire is to get rid of it, almost at any cost: and we are too ready to swallow whatever promises a moment's ease, even though it threaten great ultimate mischief to the constitution.

That these were the motives which induced the House of Lords to reject the Episcopal Bill, is plain from the whole tenour of the debate, and from the desires for the

welfare of the Church so strongly exprest by all its opponents. It would be almost evident from the mere fact, that among the opponents of the Bill were two such men as the Earls of Chichester and Harrowby, whose whole lives bear witness to their love for Christ and His Church, and who have no wish more at heart than to preserve that form of it, in which it was establisht in England by our blessed Reformation, not indeed by a servile adherence to that which may be temporary or antiquated in it, but by zealously supporting whatever will tend to strengthen and diffuse its spirit.

Moreover, while the debate supplies us with the most satisfactory evidence that the present constitution of the Court of Appeal did not arise from any purpose to trench upon the rights of the Church, but merely from inadvertence in its framers, as I have already stated in the Notes on my last Charge; it also shews that there is no reluctance in the House of Lords, or in the Government, to allow the defects in that Court to be corrected, when a judicious mode of correcting them shall be brought forward. Thus the Bishop of London, speaking of the time when the present Court of Appeal was establisht, says, that he could not tell, "Why objections were not then taken to the establishment of that tribunal as a Court of Appeal on ecclesiastical matters; but, as the appeals involving doubts on points of doctrine were extremely rare, only three, or certainly not more than four, since the Reformation, it might be that no one expected that such a case as that which had been recently adjudicated upon would ever arise." Lord Brougham too, himself the author of the Bill by which the present Court was substituted for the Court of Delegates, "quite concurred

—that the Judicial Committee was framed without any expectation whatever that cases of this kind would come before it, — was framed with a view to totally different classes of cases. Had it been otherwise (he added), in all probability some different arrangements would have been introduced."

On the other hand Lord Lansdowne, speaking as the organ of the Government, said that "he had no objection to state that he considered it desirable,—that, for the purpose of shewing the public that these questions could not be determined without the great authorities of the Church being fully heard, it should not be left to the Crown, or to the President of the Council, as in the recent case, merely to invite the attendance of right reverend Prelates, but that any Bishop, being a Privy Councillor, should *de jure* be a member of the tribunal in such cases; and he considered further, that any member of the Council, not being a member also of the Church of England, ought not to sit in such cases." These are the two chief conditions for a right constitution of the Court of Appeal, — that there should be an adequate number of ecclesiastical judges, along with the lay judges, and that none but members of our Church should sit in it. Lord Lansdowne's suggestions are not indeed quite satisfactory: but I do not see why the scheme proposed by the Bishop of London in 1847, which, he says, was submitted to a select committee of the Law-lords, and was unanimously approved by them, should not satisfy the reasonable desires of the Church. At least, if a difficulty would have arisen from the form of the recent case, in which, as it was not a prosecution for heresy or unsound doctrine,

this question only arose incidentally, and therefore would not have been brought before the Bishop of London's tribunal, a little thought would suffice to remove this difficulty, now that it is perceived.

Were such a Bill brought in without loss of time, founded upon that portion of the Bill for the better enforcement of Ecclesiastical Discipline which related to the Court of Appeal, under the form in which it received the sanction of the Law-lords, and with such modifications as shall render it applicable to questions of unsound doctrine arising incidentally, there seems to be no reason why it should not be carried, at least through the House of Lords, before the end of the Session. This would be a satisfactory indication to the Church, that there is no indisposition to redress her grievances, when a really salutary remedy is proposed. Meanwhile let us not exaggerate our grievances, but examine them closely and calmly, to ascertain their true nature and extent: and while we guard carefully against deluding and deceiving ourselves, let us be no less watchful against saying or doing what may foster delusions in others.

In making these remarks, I have followed the Report of the speeches referred to in *the Times*. There did not seem to be any advantage in comparing that Report with those in other newspapers, when I could have nothing but internal evidence for deciding amongst them; and imperfect as the best report in a newspaper must needs be, it is all that the readers in most cases have to go by; and it is that by which the mind of the nation is influenced. Having no purpose of finding fault with any person, nor any object but an apologetical one, I have deemed this course the more allowable. If I

have unwittingly misrepresented any speaker, may he accept this excuse, and forgive me. It was with the desire of doing something to disperse the fears, and to avert the evils, which the Bishop of Oxford prognosticated, not, I am afraid, without reason, that I sat down to write these Few Words. Small as their value may be, even less than their bulk, a great and comfortable truth is set forth in the old fable, in which the mouse helps the lion in extricating himself from his net. Should these words be helpful to any one in extricating himself from the delusions, in which many, I fear, are at this time entangled, it will be a blessed reward.

Notting Hill,
June 8th, 1850.

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley and Henry Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

THE UNITY OF MANKIND IN GOD:

A SERMON

PREACHED ON OCCASION OF THE JUBILEE OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

1848.

ADVERTISEMENT.

My chief motive for publishing this Sermon is the desire to promote a union between the friends of the two excellent Societies by which the Missionary work of our Church is carried on. In my second Charge,—*Privileges imply Duties*,—I have recommended the forming of Associations in every Parish in aid of them both: and this still seems to me the best way of procuring them the support which they urgently need, and which they may rightfully demand from us, as well as of securing that all the members of our Church shall be admonisht of their great twofold duty, of fulfilling our Lord's apostolical command, by providing for the Christian instruction of our Colonies, and for the preaching of the Gospel to the Heathens. One of these two great works is especially committed to one of the two sister Societies, the other to the other. There is no opposition between the two works. On the contrary each tends, and, as it advances, will tend more and more, to forward the other. For in the Kingdom of God all things are brotherly, and mutually helpful. Let us be so likewise, casting away all narrow jealousies and captious suspicions, which spring from self-will and self-opinion, and can only be mischievous, as they ever have been, in the Church. Thus shall we best speed and gain a blessing upon both works, upon our own favorite Society, as well as upon the other.

J. C. H.

November 22nd, 1848.

THE UNITY OF MANKIND IN GOD.

Ephesians ii. 14.

He is our Peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition.

The earliest record which we have of mankind, after the destruction of the prior race by the Flood, tells us that *the whole earth was of one language and of one speech.* If we cast our eyes even over a few samples of the manifold languages which are now spread over the earth, or if we chance to hear the discordant sounds which disturb the air when the natives of different regions are lifting up their voices together, it may seem to us at first thought utterly impossible that these incongruities and discrepancies should have sprung out of the same original type, or that they could ever be so smoothed and pared down and softened as to be harmonized into any sort of unity. But the most profound and laborious researches of Philology are bringing back men of learning to the very same conclusion, that all the languages on the face of the globe, however they may differ from each other, not merely in their sounds and characters, but in their inward structure and organization, are still branches or offsets or suckers from the same original stem. Thus that unity, which belongs to all the works of the Creation, notwithstanding their innumerable and enormous diversities,—that unity which is theirs inasmuch as

they express the Wisdom and the Will of the same Divine Author, and by which they all work together in inviolate, inviolable order for the accomplishment of the same Divine Purpose,—this unity is also found to exist in the words which express the thoughts and feelings of mankind. Men's words differ and vary and seem utterly repugnant to each other, even as it is with their thoughts and feelings. They look like a tangled medley, like a confused mass, the offspring of chance and caprice, like a multitudinous Chaos, which the winds from every point of the compass are rocking and dashing to and fro. Yet even in this Chaos the eye of Knowledge has discerned the principles of order and of unity. Even here we may perceive how Mankind from the first were meant to be one Body, one Family, one People.

Now what was to be the principle of this union? The principle of union in a family is the common relation of its members to the same parent or ancestor. The principle of union in a nation is the common relation to the same soverein, to the same government, to the same institutions, to the same laws. In each of these cases too the union is more perfect and entire, in proportion as its principle acts, not like an outward bond, which can never by any force press people into unity,—for a fagot can never be compress into a tree,—but like a living inward spring of common feelings and affections,—in proportion as the common relation in the family is a spring of dutiful love toward the parent,—in proportion as the common relation in the nation is a spring of loyalty toward the soverein, of reverence for the government, of attachment to the institutions, of obedience to the laws. But when a family has been prolonged through several generations, the common father or ancestor

is forgotten ; or at least his influence ceases to be felt, and that too at the very time, when, from the decay of every other tie, it is the most needed. When nations divide, their sovereins are often at variance, and set them so ; or at all events, being no longer the same, and fancying that they have different, if not opposite interests, they form no bond of union between their subjects. Therefore we need a different bond and principle of union for mankind,—a Father, who shall be the Father, not of one family only, but of all the families upon earth,—a Father who shall not die and vanish away in the darkness of past ages, but shall live, and be ever present, dwelling in eternal light, and pouring down the rivers of that light upon all the families of mankind,—a Soverein, who shall not reign merely over one nation, but over all, whose government all shall feel watching over and guarding them from evil, and directing them to good, whose institutions and ordinances shall embrace whatever is helpful to man, whose laws shall enforce themselves by their own indwelling power, and shall extend to all the occasions of life. In a word, the only principle of union and unity for mankind is their common relation to God.

On the other hand, if there is any one fact that the history of the world declares, it proclaims, with the sound of trumpets, with fierce shouts and huzzaes, with bitter sighs and groans and shrieks, that there is a ground of separation and division in man, a ground, or rather many grounds, whereby the original Unity of Mankind has been split up and wholly destroyed, and endless variance and contention and strife have become the natural state and portion of man. If we enquire what these grounds are, we find that they may all be traced ultimately to the breach and loss of that relation to God, which is the only

principle of Unity for Mankind, — to the breach and loss of this relation, which is a relation of entire and trustful dependence, and to the attempt to substitute a state of independence and self-dependence in its stead. This is set before us in the story of the original confusion of languages. Men were no longer content to abide in their original relation to God, as His children, as His servants, dwelling in His house, and doing His will. They found out that they had a will of their own, separate from the will of God; and they wanted to do their own will, not His. They wanted to set up for themselves, to gain a position and a name for themselves, having lost their trust in God, and thereby become subject to fear. *Go to*, they said; *let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach to heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.* Being unable to reach heaven by faith, they plotted to reach it by a tower. They wanted to establish themselves safely and permanently; and by that very act they cast themselves down; because they wanted to establish themselves upon the work of their own hands, and not on the only sure and enduring foundation, their relation to their Heavenly Father and King. Nay, the very act by which they designed to preserve themselves from being scattered abroad, proved the means of their dispersion, according to the grand law, that Selfishness shall always defeat its own purposes, because its purposes, however specious they may seem, must always be contrary to God's. Though their plan was to set up a centre of union, yet, as each man was only seeking his own advantage, they poured in the poison which shivered that plan to atoms. Their speech, which was meant to be the great medium of union and

communion for mankind, became the ground of confusion, in that each man spoke only of himself and for himself, so that there was nothing but a hubbub of jarring, clashing voices.

Moreover, while division and strife thus became the natural condition of mankind, they lost the very knowledge of that relation, which alone could have helpt them out of it? They lost the very knowledge of the One God. They lost the very idea of God,—that idea in which He can admit no fellow or partner,—the idea of the One God, in whom and through whom all things and creatures are, and are one, and have also a relative unity of their own. Instead of this one God, they had many. Their gods were merely fragments and splinters, or sparks, so to say, of the true idea, fragments moulded and shaped according to the habits of their own minds, and drest out in the drapery of their own fancies. Thus even their religion, or what they called such, became a fosterer and incentive of division. As men were divided against each other, so did they conceive of their gods. Each nation, each tribe, had their own, sharing their own worst passions, and pampering them. The gods of Hamath and of Arphad, of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah, were accounted as good and as powerful as any other: and when these were proved to be impotent,—when the conqueror could cry out, *Where are they? how have they been able to withstand me? have I not dasht them to the ground? have I not trampled upon them?* —he felt an overbearing confidence, that no power, human or superhuman, could ever resist him.

Hence nations, living under Polytheism, could not form a conception of the Unity of Mankind, even as a matter of speculation,—far less such a conception as should exercise

any moral power over them, and admonish them of their mutual relations and obligations. Where God was not One, what unity could there be? The very stamp of that unity, which He has graven on our hearts and minds,—and which manifests itself, wherever man is himself, in his consciousness, in his reason, in his conscience, in the manner in which all his faculties blend and fuse themselves together in one absorbing affection,—became dim and almost evanescent. Indeed the tendency of Polytheism was to make each man his own god: in his own image each man made his god: and hence his own will was his law, which, having no higher law to regulate it, conformed to the law of sin in the members of the natural man, to the law of the passions and appetites. In this state of the world, the original Divine Unity of Mankind, in which God beheld His own image, and saw that it was good, was utterly marred and destroyed. Thus God's purpose seemed to be baffled and frustrated. He had made man to be one, one in himself, through the unity of his own nature, all his powers and faculties being pervaded and animated into a living personality by faith in his Maker, and by the complete submission and surrender of his own will to the Will of God, whereby the human will was to receive the harmony and concord of the Divine,—and one also in his union with his brethren, through mutual love and helpfulness. But when man lost his relation to God, and fell away from Him, in whom alone he was one, and without whom all things resolve into their elements, his inward unity split and was dissolved. His faculties no longer wrought harmoniously together, but jarred and wrestled against each other. His will, instead of enjoying the peace and tranquillity of selfsacrifice, and resting with holy

serenity in the full resignation of itself to the Will of God, lifted itself up in pride and defiance, attempted to shake off its yoke, struggled to burst its chains, which became such in consequence of being struggled against. In like manner was his unity with his brethren also destroyed. Jealousy and suspicion and hatred took the place of confiding love, strife of peace, confusion of harmony and concord.

So vast was the power of Sin in man, to blight and blast God's gracious work. But there is another power far mightier than the sinfulness of man, the Love of God. Although man went on pertinaciously walking in sin, and heaping one sin upon another, turning good into evil, and desolating the world, which he was set to people with the offspring of the heavenly nature wherein he was made, yet they who had eyes to discern the real course of events, might continually have beheld fresh reaches of Love, stretching out before them, and compassing them around. At length too, when everything else had failed,—the Revelations to the Patriarchs, and the Wonders in Egypt, and the Law, and the Prophets, and the Ark, and the Temple, and the Commonwealth, and the Kingdom, and the Captivity, and the Restoration,—when these and all God's other countless mercies had been cast away and trodden under foot,—when privileges were turned into snares, blessings into curses,—when that which was designed to make men humble, was perverted into the fuel of pride, and everything that should have bound them together, served only to excite and incense them against each other,—then, even then, when there seemed to be no way, every way having been tried in vain,—when all around seemed to be outer darkness, and the last gleams of light

were gone out,—then, when mankind had almost lost every flickering hope and desire for anything better, and were plunging up to their necks in the very dregs of sin,—even then God found out a way for man to escape from this miserable desolation, a way by which all strife and division might be healed, and the original Unity of Mankind might be restored. The Son of God came to be our Atonement, to set us at one with our neighbours, at one in ourselves, at one with God. He came to take away the wall of partition whereby we were cut off from God, the wall of partition which we had piled up of our sins, and in looking across which we could see nothing of the love of God, but only His wrath,—the wall of partition in consequence of which we were outcasts and aliens from heaven. Hereby He also came to set us at one in ourselves, to be in this respect also our Peace, our inward Peace, uniting all our faculties by the power of faith and of love,—of love which, being rooted in faith, was no longer lust, no longer sought its own, but learnt to know its own blessed nature, drawing in the spirit of selfsacrifice by gazing on the Divine Selfsacrifice upon the Cross. Hereby moreover he made all mankind one,—Jews and Gentiles, and every nation and tribe of the Gentiles,—breaking down every wall of partition which severed them, every wall which pride and jealousy and cupidity and blind wrath had erected,—breaking them all down by the mighty hammer of His word, and reconciling all men to God in one Body by His Cross.

Thus the purpose of Christ's coming in the flesh was in this, as in all other respects, to fulfill the original purpose of God, to overcome and remove whatever had thitherto hindered it, and to supply us with help, so that it might be thoroughly accomplisht. Now how has that purpose,—the

purpose of the Father in the beginning, the purpose for which the Son came in the fulness of time,—how has it been fulfilled? Eighteen hundred years have rolled away since He made all mankind one, by breaking down the manifold walls of partition which divided and kept them asunder. Are all mankind one? Are all the walls of partition, wherewith our sins cut us off from each other, wholly destroyed and taken away? Eighteen hundred years have rolled by, since He reconciled all nations to God in one Body by the Cross. Are all nations reconciled to God now! Surely they ought to have been so centuries ago. It should never have taken eighteen centuries to accomplish so blessed, so glorious, so delightful a work. It ought to have been accomplisht centuries ago. Shall the Sun, coming forth from the uttermost parts of the heaven, and going round to its furthest end, shed its light and heat on every creature in four and twenty hours? and shall not the mightier Sun of Righteousness, of whom the other is merely a faint image and type, complete a like circuit of the world even in eighteen centuries? Surely they who had themselves been reconciled to the Father, who had been received into the unity of His family, ought to have wasted no time, but to have given themselves up to the blessed ministry of reconciling their brethren. Surely, when they bethought themselves how precious this work is in the sight of Him by whom they had been reconciled to the Father,—how it was for this work that He descended from heaven, and took upon Him the form of a Servant, and dwelt as the Son of Man amongst us, and died for us on the Cross,—surely this thought should have stirred them to devote all their energies to the work for which their Saviour lived and died: and then it must have been

accomplisht centuries ago. But has this indeed been the case? Alas! it needs no time, it needs no consideration, no enquiry to answer this question. The answer forces itself upon us on every side. From every nation, from every people, from every language, from every city, from every house, from every heart, the same answer rises, in a million modes of utterance, *No*, *No*, *No*. Our Lord's part of the work was finisht more than eighteen centuries ago. No part of it was left incomplete. The last enemy was overcome. The last barrier was cast down. The last payment was made. The last drop of blood was shed. The gate of heaven, which had been closed at the Fall, was thrown open. The angels of heaven descended upon the Son of Man. The promist Spirit was granted. Yet even now, eighteen centuries after, man's part is still unfulfilled. He has slumbered and slept; he has loitered by the way; he has neglected his blessed work; he has forgotten his glorious calling. Of those who were reconciled to God by the blood of the Cross, millions, and hundreds of millions, are still destitute of the knowledge of Christ, still aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, still strangers from the covenant of promise, have still no hope, are still without God in the world.

Alas! my brethren, are these things indeed so? and can we be assembled on this day to celebrate a Jubilee? When the fulness of the nations is brought in, when the kingdoms of the earth are become the Kingdoms of our God and of His Christ, then indeed it will behove us to lift up our voices to heaven in a solemn, praiseful jubilee, singing to the Lord who has triumphed so gloriously, and shouting, *Hosanna to the Son of David, who cometh in the name of the Lord!* But now . . . what can we do

now? can we rejoice now? can we give thanks now? Ought we not rather to sink to the ground in shame and crushing confusion? Yes, brethren, even now we may rejoice; even now we may give thanks. As we are told that there is joy in the presence of God for every single sinner that repenteth, so may we rejoice and give thanks for every portion, the very least, of this blessed work, of calling the nations into the Kingdom of Christ, which has been brought to a completion. We are so weak, so helpless; it beseems us to be thankful, if we are enabled by God's grace to perform a very small work in His service. Our Lord Himself has taught us this lesson by the commendation which He bestowed on the widow's mite. We may rejoice,—not indeed without shame for our miserable shortcomings, for our supineness and sloth, for our carelessness and indifference: for these we should take shame to ourselves, and implore God's forgiveness. But for every portion of the work of grace which has been wrought, we may rightly give thanks and rejoice. For every part of the work is so precious; every grain of sand is a priceless diamond; every single soul that is rescued is an heir of a blessed immortality. The work too in every part is God's work, not only in that it is wrought for Him, but also in that whatever success may have attended it can only have proceeded from Him, from the working of His Spirit: and therefore may we rightfully rejoice and give thanks.

We may give thanks for what has been done, even though it falls short so miserably of that which ought to have been done. But, if we do so in a right spirit, we shall also take shame to ourselves for the meanness and imperfection of the work; and we shall pray earnestly that more may be done from this time forward, and that

the hindrances, which have hitherto thwarted and checkt the work, may be removed. What are those hindrances? In the main they are the very same which from the first set themselves to frustrate God's purpose for the Unity of Mankind, which set themselves to break up that Unity, and to breed division and contention and enmity,—sin in its manifold forms, the whole brood of selfishness, sloth, carelessness, indifference to the welfare of others, the seeking of our own pleasure, of our own supposed advantage, of our own glory, instead of God's, the doing of our own will, instead of God's. One form of this universal disease, which has especially hampered and crippled us in this field of duty, is the exaltation of our own wisdom and judgement, the pertinacious cleaving to our own opinions and prejudices, which are often only the more obstinate and clamorous from the want of any solid ground to stand on, and the contemptuous, undiscerning rejection of whatever does not bend and conform to those prejudices. Through the influence of this evil spirit, in the field where the Lord sowed the good seed of peace and love, the enemy has continually been sowing the seed of discord and strife. He has done this largely even in our Lord's own peculiar province. Dissension and strife have raged, not merely in the world, but also no less fiercely and obstinately in the Church; so much so, that the *odium theologicum* has become proverbial, as among all kinds of hatred the bitterest and most unrelenting,—so much so, that they who have profest themselves zealous disciples of Christ have oftentimes deemed themselves warranted in using the sword in His service, notwithstanding His absolute prohibition and warning,—so much so, that the world has heard of such monstrous, godless abominations as religious wars. Thus the

unity of the Church has been perpetually broken up, even as the unity of the world had been. Thus divisions, disputes, controversies are unintermittingly troubling her peace. Thus she has in all ages been distracted by parties, as we see in the early history of the Corinthian Church, and is so in our days almost as much as ever. Even when we engage in the blessed work of calling the nations into the Kingdom of Christ, even then we do not cast away our party-spirit. Even then we are apt to look with an evil eye on those who are engaging in the same blessed work under a different banner. Even then we often forget our Lord's declaration, which surely applies especially to such works, that he who is not against Him is for Him. Hereby this work is grievously hindered.

The pious Founders of the Society, whose Jubilee we are this day commemorating, were aware of this temptation, which was so likely to beset their path; and, in the first account they issued of their aims, they were careful to guard against it. "Let not this Society (they said) be considered as opposing any that are engaged in the same excellent purpose. The world is an extensive field; and in the Church of Christ there is no competition of interests. From the very constitution of the human mind, slighter differences of opinion will prevail, and diversities in external forms; but in the grand design of promoting Christianity all these should disappear. Let there be a cordial union among all Christians in promoting the common salvation of their Lord and Saviour." The spirit of Christian wisdom and love, which breathes in these words, is especially needful to those who engage in any of the great works of the Church. For such persons will often be animated by an earnest zeal in their peculiar task; and as everything

human, even our best virtues, have their besetting sins, into which they are prone to lapse, so is zeal apt to become excessive,—I do not mean, on the positive side, but on the negative,—not by labouring too diligently, too devotedly in the work of the Gospel, but by attaching an exclusive importance to certain unessential, and often insignificant accidents of its own peculiar portion of that work, and by looking with suspicion and jealousy on those who are labouring in the same work, if they do not make use of the very same tools, and wield them in the very same manner. Thus does the accursed spirit of Selfishness, the subtilest among all the beasts of the field, manifest itself even here, by setting up its own particular idols by the side of God's glory, idols which often hide that glory from us, and prevent our seeing how others, while they do not pay homage to those idols, are still offering up their services to the same Divine glory and love. But what is this, except the spirit of Cain creeping into the vineyard of the Lord? the spirit which our Lord Himself rebuked in the Sons of Thunder, the spirit through which the disciples forbad such as walkt not with them to work miracles in His name. In an age like the present, when party-spirit, after having been almost expelled from the contests of political life, has taken refuge in the Church, as in its last stronghold, it behoves us to be especially watchful against its noxious assaults. For we are exposed to them on all sides. Not only are there divisions and schisms among those portions of the great Body of Christ, which are establisht in different lands; but even in our own land that Body is rent asunder; and the parts of it, instead of working together to fulfill their several offices, are striving against each other, to the grievous injury of the whole. Nay, even within the pale of our own National

Church, that selfishness, which, when it spreads through masses, takes the form of party-spirit, is mighty to work incalculable mischief. Even when Societies are formed for carrying out the great work of restoring the Unity of Mankind, by bringing all nations into the One Body, which is animated by the One Spirit, and into which we are called in the One Hope of our Calling, by the One Lord, through the One Faith, by the instrumentality of the One Baptism, to the One God and Father of all,—even then our prejudices and our vices will not allow those Societies to work together in sisterly union and concord, each in its peculiar field of labour. Many of the zealous supporters of one Society will frown on and turn away from its sister, engaged in the same work, but supposed to be more closely connected with the members of a different, which they choose to account an opposite, party. Hereby, among other mischiefs, they increase the very evil complained of, throwing that which ought to be the organ of the whole Church into the arms of a party; instead of endeavouring to counteract whatever there may be injurious in any peculiar bias, by throwing in their weight on the opposite side. This is the usual blind practice of Sectarianism, which draws off and insulates certain elements of the faith, to its own detriment, as well as that of the body it secedes from, instead of mixing up these elements actively and energetically with the leaven whereby the whole mass is to be leavened. Meanwhile they who have no zeal in behalf of either Society, are glad to conceal their own lukewarmness in the cause in which both are engaged, by crying out against what they deem objectionable in one of them. Thus they attain their end: while they give scantily and grudgingly with the one hand, they can withhold the other

altogether. Many too, very many, are repelled and disgusted by the spectacle of these jealousies and bickerings and quarrels, and turn away to secular pursuits, where their tranquillity is less disturbed by controversial wranglings. For in all ages the dissensions of Christians have been the bane and scandal of the Church, the cause of her weakness, and of the victories the world has so often gained over her, notwithstanding that its Prince had been utterly conquered and cast to the ground by her Lord. Hardly any blessing that could accrue from this day of Jubilee would be greater, both for ourselves, and for the whole Church, more especially for the promotion and prosperity of our godly work,—nor could any be more appropriate for such a day,—than if it were to be a day of hearty reconciliation, a day for the complete banishment of all jealousies and suspicions of our brethren, a day from which we were to cooperate diligently and cordially with all the other Societies in our Church engaged in similar undertakings. O that this spirit might reign in us, and equally so in those who at present may differ from us, and look with disfavour upon us!

For great and urgent is the need in these days, that all who love the Lord Jesus, and desire that His name may be glorified throughout the world, and that all mankind should become partakers of the redemption He has wrought for them,—should come out of their division and separation and strife and enmity, into that holy union and unity with their brethren and with the Father to which He has called them. Great is the need that all such persons,—far too few, however many they may be,—should not waste and scatter their powers in contending with each other, but should gather them all, and marshal

and train and brace them for the mighty apostolical enterprise to which they are summoned. That enterprise is vast and arduous at all times, and even in its smallest portions, so vast and arduous that none but the Son of God, none but the Holy Spirit of God can accomplish it: nor can any human being effect anything therein, except through the power of that Spirit. But that power is granted to those who seek it in faith; and in the whole of the work God vouchsafes to act through human instruments, making them His fellowworkers. Wherefore they also must bestir themselves, with that diligence which springs from faith, and from a consciousness of the momentous matter they have in hand. Every year that is spent in the Missionary work, new fields of labour open before us. The higher we mount, the wider the prospect spreads out. When the Church Missionary Society was first establisht, its immediate view was limited to one settlement on the coast of Africa, at Sierra Leone, to which after five years it was at length enabled to send out two missionaries. And now, in this its year of Jubilee, its settlements girdle the earth; and the voice of praise and thanksgiving are ascending to heaven on this day from its stations in every region of the globe. They have spread from one sea to the other, and from the flood to the end of the world. Thus does the mustard-tree ever grow from the least of all seeds, and become the greatest among herbs. Small as may be the seed which man sows, if it be a living seed, God will raise a great tree out of it, yea, a tree for the healing of the nations. Therefore thankfulness for what we have been enabled to effect, even with such small means, ought to incite us to labour far more diligently; while the sight of what has already been achieved is the best pledge that

a like success will attend our more extensive efforts, if they are carried on in a right spirit, of faith and love, of humility and self-sacrifice. Every station which we occupy is surrounded by a vast wilderness, which cries to heaven for husbandmen to cultivate it. Wherever the lamp of the Gospel is kindled, it reveals huge masses of darkness visible. This is a work too, in which, having begun, we must go on. For greater will be the sin of falling away, than of never having entered upon it. We must not incur the shame of having commenced a great work without counting the cost. We must not doom ourselves to that banishment from the Kingdom of Heaven, which is the portion of such as draw back, after putting their hand to the plough.

Moreover how are we helpt on every side! How have the facilities for the great work of calling the nations out of the anarchy of this world into the unity of the Kingdom of God been increasing and multiplying every year! Compare the state of the world, as it is now, with what it was fifty years ago. When we take such an interval as this, we can form a better conception of the changes that are continually going on. What difficulties then beset the Missionary undertaking, many of which have lessened greatly, some wholly vanisht! How have the mechanical arts themselves been ministering to the Kingdom of Christ! Though these have no divine power in themselves, they call upon us to sanctify them, to redeem them from the meanness of being mere instruments of worldly wealth, and to render them subservient to His glory, to make them wheels of the chariot in which He is to pass over the world. Many are running to and fro; and knowledge is increast. But who are they who should run to and fro, except they whose feet are

beautiful upon the mountains, who are the bringers of good tidings, who publish peace? And what is the knowledge that should increase, unless the knowledge of our God and of His Christ? Without this, our running to and fro will have less of wise purpose than the flight of birds. Without this, our knowledge itself will only teach us to dissect the putrefying carcase of the world. Whereas, with this knowledge, all other will become precious; for this will season it with salt. To the wonders which the Prophet announced as ordained to attend on the coming forth of the Branch out of the stem of Jesse, we may now add fresh wonders, the wonders of the steam-engine in its various modes of operation, the wonders of the electric telegraph, whereby the North and the South are brought together, and the East and the West are almost joined into one. Surely these wonders are meant to prepare the way for the restoration of the Unity of Mankind. All are ready to minister to Christ. Earth, water, air, desire to bear their part in spreading the Gospel of His Kingdom.

And may we not say the same of man? When all things else are ready, shall the only thing wanting be "the human spirit divine?" Surely, my brethren, there are signs and tokens that this spirit has not been wholly untoucht by the dawn of the coming day. When we look back to the difficulties which our Society had to encounter in its first years, the general apathy and indifference to the things of God,—when we call to mind how five years past away before it obtained the means of sending out a single missionary,—how still year after year rolled on, and no one was found in our whole Church willing to gird himself for this apostolical work,—how the Society consisted of little more than a small knot of religious friends,

who were reduced to the necessity of importing their labourers from Germany,—when we compare these recollections of the past with that which is now seen every year, with the thousands who attend its Meetings, with the two thousand Auxiliary Associations establisht in all parts of the land, with its list of subscriptions multiplied more than a hundredfold, — we must needs confess, with thankful hearts to Him who has wrought all this for us, that the efforts of this Society have indeed been wonderfully prospered and blest. And our thankfulness is hightened, when we consider that this change in her condition is indicative of a somewhat similar change in the religious spirit of the English people, at least among the better educated classes. God has wrought this change for us; and therefore does it behove us to give thanks, and to take courage, and to stir up ourselves and others to renewed and more vigorous exertions, so that our thousands may become millions, that every settlement of the Society may become the centre of a Church, and every Church the evangelizer of a people.

Again, when the Society was first establisht, we were in the middle of a fierce, desolating war, in which all the energies of the nation were called forth for the task of self-preservation, to defend our own country, and to uphold the liberties of Europe. But now, for more than thirty years, down to this year, the world has been enjoying comparative peace. Rumours of wars have indeed reacht us from far countries, but only to make us more vividly feel the blessing of the general peace. Even as it was at the first Advent of Him who came to be in all ways the Prince of Peace, so has it been now. Let us hail this sign as proceeding from Him, as a sign and herald of His wider and mightier Advent over the earth. It will be such, if as such

we receive it, and devote ourselves to bring about its accomplishment, if we open our hearts to the Spirit who is moving upon the face of the earth. O how blessed will be our lot, if we may, each of us, according to our station and means, be permitted to forward and hasten that glorious Advent! And we may do so, brethren; the very weakest and meanest may do so, if he will not thwart and quench the influences of the Spirit. Even the world is now desiring and endeavouring to change its skin, and has found out that war ought not to be the ordinary state of mankind. Even they who look solely to worldly ends, and worldly means, and worldly motives, are beginning to think that peace ought to be an object of constant and strenuous aim, as a mere worldly end, and that it may be attained by worldly means, under the sway of worldly motives, by teaching people how it will promote the political and economical welfare of mankind. The lesson is indeed a very true one; yet a deep fallacy lurks in the scheme. As peace, unity, oneness, is the normal condition of mankind, the condition for which God made and designed man, every orderly, normal relation of man, whether personal, social, or political, tends to promote peace; while peace in turn fosters every orderly, normal relation. Still, as, when the source is impure, the water that flows from it cannot be pure, so can nothing really, essentially good ever spring from selfishness, even after all the processes whereby it may be decocted and refined into the most enlightened self-interest. In fact enlightened self-interest is a contradiction in terms; for no true light can be let in upon selfishness, without disclosing its hollowness and sordidness: if you enlighten, you destroy it. The peace which is extracted from such a

cause, will never be wholesome, will never be serene, will never be truly peaceful. Peacefulness is the attribute of the Wisdom from above, not of that from below. Selfish cares, selfish interests, rivalities, grudgings, jealousies will perpetually rise up to trouble such peace, until the atmosphere becomes filled with foul vapours, and the storms of war, with their lightning and thunder, are necessary to purify it. Such a peace, as has often been seen in the history of nations, will be demoralizing, corrupting, debasing. Many of the noblest qualities in humanity, all that we admire as especially manly and heroic, will find no fuel in it, and no vent, and after a while will seek a vent in military prowess. In true Christian peace, on the other hand, in peace that is grounded, not on that fiction, an enlightened self-interest, but on love and self-controll and self-sacrifice, every virtue, every grace, the noblest and manliest and most heroic, as well as the meekest and gentlest, will find ample fields for action, fields which will go on expanding before us the further we advance in them, and in which each class will be continually blending with and passing into the other. Nevertheless we will not rebuke or mock at the world's peace, hollow and unstable though it be. Shame and conscience, if nothing else, should withhold us from this. For might not the world ask, *Where is your peace, ye who say that Christianity can produce it? what has Christianity effected for this end during eighteen hundred years?* Let us be thankful rather that the world has discerned, even in this manner, that it is called to be one, and that peace becomes it far more than strife and contention. Let us endeavour to avail ourselves of this, and of every other advantage which the world holds out to us for our apostolical work, and to

sanctify it by infusing a higher principle into it, and by consecrating it to the service of Christ's Kingdom. And let us beware of the disgraceful contrast, which would be exhibited to the eyes of men and angels, if, when the world is panting after peace, and when soldiers, at the head of nations, are sacrificing their favorite aims and visions, to maintain the peace of the world, dissension and contention and strife should prevail and rage in the Church of the Prince of Peace. Let it not be made manifest in this way, that the children of this world are still so much wiser in their generation, than the weak, frail, blundering, stumbling children of light.

We have seen how a number of signs and tokens in these days are pointing toward the Unity of Mankind. Science is recognising it as man's aboriginal state; and the conclusions drawn from the examination of languages are continually receiving confirmation from all manner of researches into the history, the literature, the mythology, the religions, of the various nations upon earth. Science, in union with the mechanical arts, is also doing what in them lies toward the restoration of that unity. Even Statecraft is throwing away its favorite traditionary maxim, that power and empire are to rest upon division, and is beginning to learn the simple lesson, that, for the social edifice, as for every other, the foundations ought to be compact and well cemented. At the same time this year has proclaimed to us by the voice of earthquakes and convulsions, that Statecraft has no power of laying such compact, well cemented, stable foundations. Those which were laid centuries ago, cemented by faith, have endured through centuries until now; but, the faith having past away, the earth has heaved and cast them up. One kingdom of this

world after another has been tottering and falling; every idol of earthly Statecraft has been overthrown. Bel boweth down; Nebo stoopeth: they stoop, they bow down together: they could not deliver the burthen, but are gone themselves into captivity. These events have filled us with astonishment and awe; and marvellous they indeed are to the natural eye: but to an eye purged by heavenly wisdom they are merely revelations and manifestations of that which is, and of that which shall be. They are manifestations of the hollow phantoms, the chasm of unrealities, which lie beneath the deceitful surface of outward life. They are also prophetic signs of the destruction which will sweep away everything earthly, and before which Thrones and Dominions and Potentates will be as powerless as a falling leaf. Therefore, taking warning from these signs, let us strive more and more earnestly to plant our feet upon the Rock, to lay our foundations upon the Rock, that shall stand fast for ever and ever. Let us always endeavour to build on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and on Him who has vouchsafed to be the Cornerstone of His Church. And as we in England are called above other nations, by that unparalleled supply of means for the conversion of mankind, which is itself the sign and signal of a duty, to labour more than all for the spreading of the Gospel of salvation,—as we are appointed to occupy one of the great central posts in the grand Unity of Mankind,—and as we are mercifully allowed to lift up our heads in safety, while so many nations around us are sinking into misery and confusion,—let us strive continually, in thankfulness for all these wonderful privileges and mercies, with heart and soul and mind and strength, with all the means of outward power, with faith and hope and love and

constant prayer, to fulfill this our glorious and blessed calling. So, when another Jubilee of this highly favoured Society comes round, may we be enabled by God's blessing to see the fruits of our labours in thousands and millions, where we now see tens and hundreds: so may we behold tribe after tribe, and nation after nation, and people after people, gathered into the Church of the Saviour: and so may we be allowed to join with the blessed Communion of Saints in lifting up the shout of triumph,—*Hallelujah! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. The kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our God and of His Christ: and He shall reign for ever and ever. Amen.*

LONDON:
Printed by S. & J. Bentley, Wilson, and Fley,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

Lately Publisht:

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN TIMES OF TRIAL: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1848, with Notes, especially on the Controversy touching the Management of Schools, and on the Jewish Question.

THE MISSION OF THE COMFORTER, and other Sermons, with Notes.

THE VICTORY OF FAITH: Second Edition.

SERMONS PREACHT IN HERSTMONCEUX CHURCH.

THE BETTER PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1840, with Notes.

PRIVILEGES IMPLY DUTIES: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1841, with Notes.

THE MEANS OF UNITY: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1842, with Notes, especially on the Anglican Bishopric at Jerusalem, and on the Need of an Ecclesiastical Synod.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH: a Sermon, with some Introductory Remarks on Uniformity.

LETTER TO THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER, on the appointment of Dr Hampden to the See of Hereford. Second Edition, with a Postscript.

PORTIONS OF THE PSALMS IN ENGLISH VERSE, selected for Public Worship.

GUESSES AT TRUTH, by Two Brothers. First Series, Third Edition, revised; Second Series, Second Edition, with Large Additions.

Preparing for Publication.

THE WANTS OF THE CHURCH:—ROMANIZING FALLACIES:—THE ROMANIZING TENDENCIES OF THE AGE: THREE CHARGES delivered at the Visitations in 1843, 1845, 1846, with Notes.

NOTES TO THE VICTORY OF FAITH.

SERMONS PREACHT ON PARTICULAR OCCASIONS. Second Edition, with Notes.

GUESSES AT TRUTH, by Two Brothers: Third Series, enlarged.

EDUCATION

THE NECESSITY OF MANKIND:

A SERMON

PREACHT AT HURSTPIERPOINT

ON THE 25TH OF JUNE, 1851,

AT THE LAYING OF THE FOUNDATION STONE OF

THE SCHOOL FOR THE MIDDLE CLASSES:

BY JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES.

LONDON:

JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND:

SOLD BY MACMILLAN, CAMBRIDGE.

1851.

LONDON:
Printed by SAMUEL BENTLEY AND CO.
Bangor House, Shoe Lane

TO THE REVEREND NATHANIEL WOODARD,

PROVOST OF St NICOLAS COLLEGE, SHOREHAM.

My dear Friend,

I cannot deny myself the pleasure of dedicating this Sermon to you. For to you I owe it that I was allowed to take so prominent a part on a day which was a bright spot in the midst of much darkness and sorrow. When our Church was mourning over the apostasy of so many of her children, and when distrustful surmises and insinuations were daily multiplying the losses we had actually sustained, you called on us to look forward hopefully, and cheered us with the prospect that, if we do not slothfully or contentiously neglect to carry out the good work which you have been commissioned to set before us, she will be greatly strengthened for the conflicts which await her.

You are aware how cordially from the first I have rejoiced at your undertaking. The want which you are endeavouring to remedy, I had long felt and deplored, and had earnestly desired to see some measures adopted for relieving it. Hence, when I first read your *Plea for the Middle Classes*, it seemed to me almost like the voice of my own heart, like a realization of what I had been longing for: and the practical wisdom manifested in your plan, combined with the

self-devoting zeal, which, it was evident, had dictated and was animating your enterprise, encouraged the hope that, what others had vainly dreamt and talkt of, you, under God's blessing, which is ever vouchsafed to such zeal, would be enabled to effect. Under this persuasion, I have taken every opportunity of doing and saying what I could to forward your work, and to allay those jealousies and suspicions, whereby, in these days more than ever, a man of strong convictions is sure to be assailed. With this view I spoke at some length about your School in my Charge for 1849; and great would be my delight if I could see our brethren casting aside their party animosities, and joining heartily in promoting a work, which is truly of national importance, and worthy that all loyal members of the English Church should unite for its accomplishment.

I know too well that this is hardly to be expected. Even the good have ever been prone to conceive that there is only one way in which any real good can be done, that which leads from their own house to their own church: and the deplorable weakness of our Faith is continually betraying itself by leaning on the crutches of some favorite notions, and fearing lest it should stumble if it stretch out its hand to Charity. Meanwhile the sluggish and worldly-minded are glad to avail themselves of every excuse, and will take up any cant cry, which may seem to warrant them in clinging to their pet maxim, that Charity is to begin at home, and will act wisest in ending where it begins.

With these latter opponents you will hardly prevail, at least until your success has become so conspicuous that their support will be of comparatively little

importance. With the former class, though it is almost as easy to break through a hedge of cactuses, as through a hedge of religious prejudices, the case is not quite desperate. The milder and more candid amongst them may be induced after a while to do you justice, when they see with what singleness and straightforwardness, as well as self-denying, self-sacrificing zeal, you pursue your noble object, the education of the whole body of our Middle Classes in the fear and love of God, as dutiful children of our National Church. The pledges which you have already given, your assurance, on the day on which this Sermon was preacht, that the grand building which we were then inaugurating, should be vested in the hands of Trustees for the education of the children of the Middle Classes according to the principles of the Church of England, and that, in determining what those principles are, you would be guided by the authority of our Bishop, ought to have conciliated and convinced your adversaries, and must in time lessen their number. The manly Christian generosity with which our Bishop himself spoke on that occasion, the confidence which he exprest in you,—plainly as in the last year he has manifested his intense repugnance to Popery,—ought to have exercised an influence upon those who had nothing beyond idle rumours to counterbalance his careful scrutiny of your character and aims.

It has been objected indeed that, when you said on that day, that, if the Bishop's decision should press too hard upon you, you would then leave the Diocese, you were contemplating the possibility of joining the deserters who have gone from us to Rome. Surely however

it ought to be recognised that he who is consecrating such a work, a work to which he has not only given up his whole substance, but all the energies of his heart and mind for a number of years, to the service of our Church, cannot be harbouring any lurking thoughts of being ever induced or driven to forsake her. Can a parent forsake his child? the object of so many anxious cares, of so many yearning desires, of so much labour and toil, of so many ardent hopes, of so many fervent prayers? What a joy will it be to you to see this work completed! What thanksgivings will burst from your heart to Him who has blest your efforts! And can any one think it possible that you can be cherishing a thought of abandoning it,—of abandoning the noble work to which you have devoted your life? A candid interpreter would have perceived that you were only speaking of an extreme case, of the possibility that some Bishop hereafter might entertain views on the principles of our Church contrary to your own, and might attempt to enforce them upon you; in which extreme case, you said, you would have to withdraw to another Diocese, and commence a like work there, leaving the Hurstpierpoint School behind you as a legacy to our Diocese. Surely they who are continually talking about the liberty of conscience, ought not to grudge you thus much of that liberty, which you could not assert except at the cost of such a sacrifice.

I know, my dear Friend, you counted the cost, before you entered on your work. You were not ignorant that you would have to encounter many difficulties, in addition to those which always beset a great work, and without which it could not be so great; that you would

be sorely let and hindered by the opposition of religious prejudices. But you are not a man to be daunted, when you have a high object in view; and no man ever had a higher. Therefore God, you may trust, will prosper it, as to Him seems best for the good of His Church in England. At the same time let us bear in mind that, if these prejudices are over vivacious and pugnacious, they have had much to feed and strengthen them in these last years. When so many persons are sliding and slipping down into the Romish abyss, we must not wonder, nor should we bitterly complain, if the fears and wrath of those who know the horrours of that abyss, are somewhat vehemently stimulated.

And how does it behove us to counteract these prejudices? Surely one indispensable way is, by avoiding whatever might increase them, by making it clear to all that the whole system of teaching in your School is that of our Reformed Church, according to the strict principles of our Reformation, and in direct opposition to the corruptions of Rome. Surely too in these days, my Friend, it would be right to refrain from all unessential practices and observances, which have become offensive from having been the practices and observances of such as have lately deserted us. If these practices have seemed in so many cases to be steps in the path which leads to that terrible abyss, it is not strange that they should be eyed with deep aversion. Under this conviction I said more than I otherwise should on this point in my Sermon. In the brief hints that I gave concerning the English character of the education appropriate for the Middle Classes, I was merely repeating the substance of what has been

said by my brother, Frederic Maurice, in his fifth Lecture on Education. But the difficulties with which you have had, and will still have to contend, imprest me with the necessity of urging, as forcibly as I could, that the system of education in your School ought to be entirely free from all Romish or Romanizing taint, and that it should aim at fostering and cultivating those peculiarly English qualities, for which we are indebted in great measure to our having, under God's providential guidance, cast off the yoke of Rome.

This is a matter of paramount importance for the success of your whole plan. For the Middle Classes are the stronghold of the Protestant feeling of the English nation. When the intellect mounts to any highth, it becomes apter to turn giddy; and thus some have been carried away by logical subtilties, others by esthetical fancies, others by dreams about unity, others by the craving void of a distempered understanding. But the practical judgement of the Middle Class cannot be thus deluded. It will sweep away the finest speculative cobwebs, will turn a deaf ear to declamations about the Beautiful, will care little about historical theories: it requires practical realities. You will not stir it much by talking about what was: if you would win it, you must tell it what is. At the same time it is not inferior to any class in its strong sense and desire of spiritual realities. Feed it with them; and it will thank you: but if a person try to pamper it with Romish mummeries, it will loathe and reject them.

You, my Friend, I well know, have no hankering after such things. The whole bent of your character leads you to seek, not that which is formal and showy,

but that which is real and substantial. Thus you are especially fitted to be the educater of the Middle Classes. Your desire is to bring up true men, loyal subjects of the English Crown, living members of Christ's Church, strong in faith, and zealous of good works. With this object set before you, let not even the conviction of your own rectitude, or of the groundlessness of the charges brought against you, withhold you from making such concessions in unessential matters to the religious prejudices of the age, as may seem requisite for the success of your undertaking. Bear in mind, as we all ever should, that magnanimous declaration of the heroic Apostle, *If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.* Let this be your rule of action. Cleave to it carefully, perseveringly. And assuredly God will bless your work, and will render it a blessing to thousands and tens of thousands, not merely in this, but in many coming generations.

Your very sincere Friend,

J. C. Hare.

EDUCATION THE NECESSITY OF MANKIND.

PSALM CXLIV. 12.

That our sons may grow up as the young plants.

Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it. This was the first commandment given by the Almighty Creator to him whom He had made to have dominion over the earth and every creature upon it. Hereby this became the primary law of man's condition upon earth, a law, which, like the other laws of Nature,—the Lawgiver being Himself the Maker and Fashioner of that to which the law was given,—fulfilled itself: so firmly and indelibly was it wrought into the essential instincts of man's being, and into the permanent necessities of his condition. In what way, with what facility and rapidity, this twofold law, bearing at once on the race of man in itself, and on his relations to the world in which he was set, would have fulfilled itself, if the Paradisiacal state had continued uninterrupted, we know not: but the first act and event recorded after the Fall is the first step toward that fulfilment: and though the very next recorded act is an awful example how Sin, in this as in all things, has tried to thwart and counteract God's laws, still that law, being inherent in man's nature, has gone on fulfilling itself for generation after generation, for century after century, for millennium after millennium, even down to this day.

Sin indeed has also kept on striving to thwart, striving to counteract it, enlisting, not death only, but the whole host of hell, every folly, every vice, every crime, even the most unnatural, unutterable, unimaginable, to hinder mankind from replenishing and subduing the earth: and hence the progress of the work has been so tardy; and it is still so far from its completion. Yet from age to age it has continued advancing, not indeed without manifold local vicissitudes and alternations, but on the whole, if we take the entire race into account, steadily: and when statesmanly wisdom has stood at the head of a nation, it has felt that a main part of its duty was to promote the fulfilment of this great law of man's nature, whereby he was to replenish and to subdue the earth.

Such at least was the case down to the close of the last century. Even they who had no distinct knowledge of the law, or of its Author, recognised that it was a part of political wisdom to help in carrying it into effect. That which was inwrought into man's abiding instincts, found a reflex expression in his understanding. There are instances indeed, in which the Understanding, setting itself to devise expedients for perpetuating an exorbitant and pernicious monopoly, and unable to resist the conviction that the laws of Nature, in their regular operation, repell and reject every kind of monopoly, endeavoured to prop it up and uphold it by unscrupulous, outrageous acts of legislation. These however, as always happens when man wars against Nature,—that is, against God's laws working themselves out in the appointed order of the universe,—proved self-destructive. The order and course of the universe rolled

on; and that which tried to arrest it was crusht. But at the end of the last century, amid the stress and strain of the political and moral conflicts which were driving and tossing men's minds to and fro, a new and strange notion was broacht, namely, that this inherent, primary law of man's nature and condition, under the sway of which he had been replenishing and subduing the earth for hundreds of generations, was a main cause and source of the evil and misery in the world.

Doubtless, as in all speculations, however delusive, when the author has an honest purpose, in this also there were certain particles of truth. The Divine Law, which ordained the increase and multiplication of the human race, at the same time ordained the replenishing and subduing of the earth: and if these two ordinances, which the Divine Law thus coupled together, were not carried out concurrently and coordinately,—if hindrances were interposed by man's covetousness or sloth, by his grasping and griping, to the proper replenishing and subduing of the earth,—it was a legitimate consequence of this separation, that the disproportionate multiplication of mankind, as it arose from the sin of man, should also be accompanied by self-procreating and multiplying sin, and by its irrepressible consequence, misery. But, as in our individual constitution, both physical and moral, pain and suffering are at once the indications of disorder, and incitements to the restoration of order,—so in the body politic has misery, in its manifold forms, ever been a call upon persons entrusted with any charge of government to remedy the evil, which has resulted from some disorganization or disorder in the political system. Never has the evil or misery arisen

from the inability of the earth to support and nourish the multitudes of human beings quartered upon it: never, we may be sure, will it arise from that cause. One sufficient proof of this is, that the evil and misery ascribed thereto have been quite as great in very thinly peopled countries, as in the most populous, if not still greater and more destructive. In both they have been monitors to man, that he has failed to fulfill his duty of replenishing and subduing the earth, that he has left large regions of it waste and barren, that, even in the best cultivated regions, the means adopted for the production and distribution of food fall far short of what they might, and therefore ought to be. Thus, if we look through history, they have ever been among the chief agents whereby the governors of nations have been stimulated and almost constrained to fulfill this great duty; as on the other hand they have been the terrible punishment for the obstinate, heedless neglect of it.

I do not mean that the neglect of this one primary law is the sole cause of all the evil and misery in the world. Whenever we set about enquiring into the causes of any evil, whenever we ask what they are, the answer is always, *Legion*. For manifold forms of selfishness and folly and vice have combined in producing it. Before the Fall, the work committed to man was to replenish and to subdue the earth. Since the Fall, he has had another more arduous and difficult task superadded thereto, even to subdue himself, to subdue the Legion within him, to bring himself, and all his faculties, and all his desires, and all his affections, and all the motions of his will, into due subjection and subordination to

the law of God, as written upon his reason and his conscience: and this, with sundry modifications, and in divers proportions, has been the work appointed, not merely for man in his individual, but also in his corporate capacity. This is the work appointed for nations also, if statesmen would believe it. Indirectly, by their measures, if they are wise ones, they will promote the fulfilment of the law for the increase and multiplication of mankind, which is ever rapid in periods of national prosperity. But at the same time it is a still more momentous portion of their duty to do what in them lies for promoting the moral well-being of the people, which alone will render its increase a blessing, and to check and remove those social and moral evils, which inevitably turn that blessing into a curse. Through the operation of these evils, which become more glaring and startling, in proportion as the masses of society under their influence are huger, we are continually hearing nowadays of the mischiefs which accrue from what, by a modern phrase, we call a *surplus population*. That which of yore was deemed the strength of a nation, is now regarded as a cause of weakness. Our social relations are so disordered and confounded, that, while every sheep and every ox, nay, every ear of corn and every blade of grass, is counted an element of national wealth, man alone, he for whom all these other things were made, and to whom they are subjected, has become a creature of questionable value in the political ledger.

Surely, my brethren, I am justified in saying that, when this is the result arrived at by our boasted political economy, our social relations must be strangely

disordered and confounded. Surely there must be something very wrong and rotten in the state of England, when a man, in an economical view, is not worth what he eats and drinks, when a healthy man cannot add more to the stock of national wealth than he withdraws from it for the necessities of his subsistence. Now concerning the political and social errours, of which such a fact is a symptom, this is not a time and place to speak. But every political and social evil has a moral evil lying at its root: and to spend a few thoughts on this will not be inappropriate to the present occasion. In doing so we may follow the guidance of the text, in which the Psalmist, while enumerating and invoking the various elements of national wealth and prosperity, prays for the kingdom of Israel, that her *sons may grow up as the young plants.* What, my brethren, shall we say here, standing, as we do, at the centre of this wonderful nineteenth century?—wonderful, as all time is, to those who are living in the midst of it, and who have any notion of the awful mysteries with which life is pregnant; wonderful to those who know not what even tomorrow will bring forth, and who yet are bound to act, both for themselves and for others, as persons on whose actions a long, it may be an eternal tomorrow, both for themselves and others, may depend. Shall we desire and pray for England, that her sons, all her sons, all whom the great Author of life and being shall give to her, *may grow up as the young plants?* Or shall we rather say, *It is enough: close up the womb: England's cup is already full: there is no room for more life in it: every child born in her, beyond a determinate number, to which we have already attained, will come into life*

as an heir of misery, and will be a source of misery and derangement to his neighbours? If we shrink from such expressions as audaciously presumptuous, so as to reach the very brink of blasphemy,—if we feel that, as in a family it is the duty of the parents to give God thanks and blessings for every new life that He bestows on them, and as all the members of the family should hail and welcome their new brother with joy, so, in the rightful state of a nation, every new human life granted to it, every fresh heart and mind and soul added to its members, should also be welcomed with thankfulness,—we shall be convinced that it behoves us to turn away from this modern lore, to be assured that He who gave man the command to increase and multiply and replenish the earth, lookt forward in His illimitable wisdom to the remotest contingent events which would result from that commandment; and, in offering up our prayers for the welfare of England, to our other petitions we shall add that of the Psalmist, *May her sons grow up as the young plants!*

If we fix our attention on the words in which this wish is exprest, we can hardly fail to notice that there is something singular in them. The desire and prayer of the Psalmist is, that the sons of Israel *may grow up like the young plants.* Now when we are wishing for the good of any creature, the natural, reasonable wish would seem to be, that it may become like to something better than itself, to a being of a higher and nobler order. Thus the object which man is commanded to aim at, is to become holy as God is holy, and perfect as our Heavenly Father is perfect, to become like-minded with Christ, to put on the mind of Christ, to

imitate His example, to follow His steps. Whereas the Psalmist desires that the children of men may grow up like that which stands far beneath them in the scale of being, like creatures that have no thought or affection, no will or conscience, like plants. On a moment's reflexion however, we shall call to mind that similar comparisons are common in the Scriptures. For this is one of the awful penalties which wait upon sin, that it degrades its victims below that which stands beneath them in the natural order of being. Even in man's own nature, we find an analogical difference, that the higher parts of it have been more injured by the Fall than the lower, his intellectual qualities more than his physical, his moral qualities still more, his spiritual qualities most of all, so as to have been crusht and almost extinguisht. In like manner, though all the parts of our earthly system of things have suffered by the Fall, and though thorns and thistles are its abiding witness even in the vegetable creation, yet the power of evil is far greater in the various tribes of animals, few of which have ever been reclaimed from their natural cunning and ferocity; while it is in man that the prince of this world has set up his throne, and that evil is most imperious and triumphant,—in man's heart and mind and spirit. Hence there is nothing anomalous in wishing that men should discharge a certain portion of their functions, which they have in common with the lower orders of the creation, as regularly as they are discharged by those lower orders. Our Lord enjoins upon His disciples to be wise as serpents, and harmless as doves: and God's faithful servants are called *trees of righteousness*. Thus they who have ever been employed

in the cultivation of plants of any kind, are continually tempted to wish that the human objects of their care and culture would grow up as rapidly, as straight, as flourishingly, would as uniformly fulfill their specific idea and purpose, as abundantly reward the labour bestowed on them.

Hence one of the peculiar characteristics of the human race, contradistinguishing it from the lower parts of the creation, is, that man requires to be educated, in order to become what he is meant to be. Even for plants indeed we have *nurseries;* and if they are to produce the choicer sorts of fruits and flowers, they need special care. But this care is far less: they reward a small portion of it far more uniformly and plenteously: and even without it, unless they are exposed to peculiar hindrances, they mostly come up to the ordinary type of their species. But for man the work of education is constant, unceasing, indispensable. Without it he would become the lowest of the animal creation. He is to educate himself: he is to educate his brethren. Our task of self-education terminates only with our lives: and we have all of us more or less to do with the task and duty of educating others, those who come near us, those who are placed under us, above all, children. Our sons will not grow up as plants, if they are left to themselves. God Himself vouchsafed, by the training and schooling of the Law, to prepare and lead us during a millennium and a half to Christ: nor, now that Christ is come, is our need of schooling past away. Our rebellious will still needs the discipline of the law: our moral being needs the teaching of faith: our affections need to be trained under the influence of spiritual love.

This therefore has ever been one main office of the Church. Her sons will not grow up as young plants,—far less will they become trees of righteousness for the garden of the Lord,—without a wise, careful, diligent, constant training and education. Even the philosophers of antiquity well knew what an important part of man's work it was to educate the young to become worthy, active, useful members of their civil commonwealths. Hence education was ever a main element in their schemes of polity, whether practical or ideal. But in proportion as the object of education has become higher and more precious, as we have attained a clearer insight into the glorious purposes for which man was created, the importance of that work has become still greater. Yet we can hardly say that the Church has duly appreciated its importance. For several generations indeed her work was little more than to Christianize her members, to bring them to the knowledge of Christ. Till she became one with the State, civil education lay for the most part beyond her sphere. And then came long centuries of darkness and corruption, during which the rulers of the Church took little thought about the enlightenment of the people, nay, at times may rather be said to have wisht that the body of the people should continue in darkness and ignorance. Even in this, as in so many other respects, the age of the Reformation is the brightest in the history of the Church, since that of the Apostles. Foundations were laid in the sixteenth century for the general education of the whole people, according to the views of those times, in England under Cranmer and our royal Edward, in Scotland under Knox, in Germany

under the fostering care and direction of Luther and Melanchthon: and so extensive was the scale of these foundations, that the next two centuries were almost content to abide upon them, and did little to enlarge them, nay, in many cases suffered them to decay and be wasted; so that divers parts of the land were more scantily provided with institutions for the general education of the people at the beginning of the nineteenth century than at the end of the sixteenth.

But during the last sixty years the depths of men's hearts and minds have been stirred up, as they had not been for generations before. The principles on which society is founded, and by which alone it can be held together, the relations among the various orders of society, their relative rights and duties, and the bonds which unite duties to all rights, have been explored and pondered over and discust again and again. It has been felt more and more that these are questions of the highest moment both to the body politic and to the body ecclesiastic, yea, that they are questions of life and death. It has also become recognised more and more that the educational institutions which have come down to us from former ages, are wholly inadequate to the wants of the present age, and that the modes and systems of former ages are no less so. There had been two modes and systems of education during the last two centuries, if indeed I should not rather say that there was only one, and that one designed for the higher classes, for the gentry and the clergy,—a mode and system whereby they were to be instructed and indoctrinated mainly in the languages and literature of the classical nations of antiquity. For the slight

catechetical instruction in the rudiments of Christianity, which was supplied during the last century to the lower orders, hardly deserves the name of a system of education. Hence, when attention began to be directed more enquiringly toward these subjects, and men began to compare these antiquated modes of preparation with the exigencies of actual life, it is not to be wondered at that many should have been offended by the strange disproportion between them; nor that, from not apprehending the necessity that the present should be grounded on the past, or perceiving the manifold complicated links by which the whole culture of mankind is bound together into a whole, they should have cried out that these obsolete systems ought to be swept entirely away, and that we should teach people what would be of use to them with reference to the daily wants of our own times. A better wisdom however has discerned, that, in this as in other things, the right course is not to cut away and destroy the institutions and practices which we have inherited from our ancestors, but to unfold and expand them. It would indeed be preposterous to confine the instruction of our youth within the narrow field of knowledge, which alone lay open to our fathers, no less preposterous than to confine our voyages and our commerce to the world known by the ancients: but, while we have so many new provinces, new literatures, and new sciences, to incorporate, still, if we would give unity and solidity to the whole body of our knowledge, we must preserve the order which the history of the world has pointed out; so that we may not be led to regard the various races of man, and their literatures, as insulated units,

but as branches spreading and diverging from the same original stem.

On the other hand the education of the lower orders has become a matter of much consideration and argument, nay, of controversy. The State has awakened to the conviction that it is bound, both by duty and by necessity, to take care that its whole population shall have such an education as promises to render them peaceable and orderly, and to fit them for the intelligent discharge of their functions as members of a free state. The Church has become more alive to her own still higher and more sacred duties. Divers disputes and contests with regard to these matters have been going on for some years, and unhappily are not yet terminated,—disputes and contests by which the accomplishment of that most pressing work is grievously protracted and delayed.

On this point however I must not allow myself to speak here. For the special purpose of our meeting this day bids me recur to the remark which I was making just now, that, whereas in former ages the modes and systems of education were twofold, one designed for the higher classes, which embraced such members of the middle or lower classes as were brought up for the ministry of the Church, and a second very meagre and imperfect one for the lower orders,—this twofold division being then in some measure fitted to comprehend the bulk of the people,—the enormous, unprecedented increase of wealth, of commerce, of trade, during the last hundred years, has produced a middle class, which comprises a very large portion of the English nation, a portion very large numerically, and whose social

weight and importance is even beyond their numbers. Of this class hardly any account was taken in the provisions for education during the last century. For the grammar-schools establisht in the sixteenth century, which were sufficient for the comparatively small number of its members at that time, had many of them fallen into decay; while many had been diverted from their original destination, and appropriated in the main for the education of the higher classes; and at all events they would have been totally inadequate to the increast wants of our days. Hence it became a primary duty of the Church in England to provide means and opportunities for the proper education of this most important portion of the nation, which had grown up so rapidly in the midst of her, without being sufficiently cared for; and which therefore had fallen away, as might have been expected, in large bodies from our Church, and had joined some one or other of our dissenting communities; a result for many reasons to be deplored, but to which it is probably owing that our middle classes have retained so much more of a Christian spirit, than is commonly found among the same classes in other nations, and have been preserved from lapsing into infidelity.

These considerations have been pressing for years on many minds. Indeed it was scarcely possible for an intelligent member of our Church to look thoughtfully round at the condition of England, without being struck by them. Many voices have been lifted up to proclaim the great urgency of this need, and to call for the establishment of a body of schools for the special education of the middle classes. Attempts also have been

made to establish such schools, but, so far as I am aware, with little success: nor have I heard of any such attempt on a scale commensurate with the extent of the need, or comparable to that which we are this day assembled to inaugurate. Hence I have felt an earnest desire to take part, if I might be permitted, in the ceremony of this day, which promises, should the faith and love which have engaged in the undertaking, be rightly guided and swayed by Christian wisdom in carrying it out, to be the beginning of inestimable good to our Church and to the whole English nation: and I feel deeply thankful that, through God's mercy, after a suspension of my ministerial labours during the last four months, I have been sufficiently strengthened to come forward on this occasion with such words of exhortation and encouragement as I may be enabled to utter.

Neither the place nor the time will admit of my entering into any discussion of the general principles which ought to regulate a system of education fitted for the particular wants of the classes this school is designed for. But I think it will readily be recognised, that, inasmuch as these classes must naturally comprehend the great bulk of the wealth and thought and intelligence of the English nation, their education ought in a special manner to be an English education. The engrossing occupations of their various callings will hardly leave them leisure for the diligent cultivation of forein literature; and superficial knowledge, which is ever rather hurtful than beneficial, would be peculiarly noxious to persons, for whom a sound, steady, sober mind is the most essential intellectual gift. But, since they must

needs exercise a primary influence in determining the future condition of England, they ought to know and understand what England has been and is, that they may help her onward in the course which the Providence of God has markt out for her. Hence the English language, English literature, as represented in our best authors, English history, the laws of England, and her constitution, ought to be the chief instruments of their intellectual discipline. They are to be bred up and trained to be good Englishmen, intelligent, loyal, patriotic members of the English State. So too should they be bred up and trained to be intelligent, loyal, loving members of the English Church.

The few remaining remarks which I can allow myself to make, must be confined to this last point. In the scheme of education to be adopted at this school, Religion, as you are aware, is intended to hold a far more prominent rank than it has usually held in our so-called public schools; in which, down to a recent period, much was taught and much was learnt about many of the Heathen gods and goddesses, but very little instruction was given to the boys even in the fundamental principles and doctrines of Christianity; as though it had been assumed that they must already have acquired whatever was needful on this subject at home. Even in these schools, it is well known, great improvements have been effected in this respect during the last quarter of a century; and the excellent example, which, I believe, was first set at Rugby, has now been generally followed. Here, we may feel a confident hope and trust, Religion is to occupy that primary place, which it ought to hold in every system of education and instruction. The whole

order and ceremonial of our proceedings today are a pledge of this intention: the character and conduct of the Founder of our school are a pledge that this purpose will be carried out. May He, who alone can give the increase, vouchsafe it abundantly for generation after generation!

At the same time, seeing that Religion, which ought to be the great bond of peace and unity, both between man and man, and between nation and nation, is in these days, by a strange and monstrous perversion, become the main seat and focus of war, even among the members of our own Church,—so that, while men are combining and cooperating zealously for every imaginable worldly object, the moment a religious work is taken in hand, it becomes a signal for all manner of jealousies and suspicions, if not for discord and contention,—it seems desirable to add here, that the system of education to be adopted at this school ought to aim, not only at bringing up the boys to be good Christians, but also to be faithful, loyal members of our Reformed Church. If they are to grow up as young plants, they should grow up like our native trees, not like exotics, not under artificial glasses, breathing a factitious climate, which would unfit them for bearing the wear and struggles of actual life, but under the naked sky, like our native English oaks. As there are such innumerable diversities in the whole vegetable world, diversities which multiply with the progress of cultivation, so are there great and countless diversities in the race of man; and these also increase and multiply with the increase of civilization. Nor does Christianity check these diversities, or repudiate and reject them, but fosters them

and developes them each after its kind. It fosters and developes the peculiarities of each national character, as well as of each individual's personal character and disposition, so that he may become what, according to God's purpose, he is especially fitted to be. A false, usurping, imperious Church, leaping, so to say, into the saddle of the expiring Roman Empire, has indeed assumed the right of laying down the rules and modes of religious life for every nation and people, suppressing and extinguishing what it was unable to expand, and could not curtail and mould in conformity to its purpose. But it would ill behove us to shape and fashion our English Christianity after the spurious, factitious Christianity of Rome. God has given His blessed gift to us, as well as to her. If in any respect we received it through her, our thanks may be due to her, as they might be to the conveyer of any other precious gift. But even these thanks are forfeited, if the conveyer would arrogate a right of determining how and in what manner we are to use the gift. The gift loses the main part of its value, unless we are allowed to use it freely, in harmony with the laws of our reason and conscience, without any human dictation. A teacher is not invested for life with a right to lord it over those whom he has taught. His highest reward is to see them outgrowing the need of his teaching, moulded and strengthened by it, and themselves moulding it anew into fresh forms of thought and action. Still less can a Church, which in the execution of her Divine commission becomes the instrument of conveying the blessings of the Gospel to a Heathen people, acquire a right thereby, transmissible

through thirty generations, to lord it over the nation that has been christianized in this manner, and to put a strait waistcoat on men's reason and conscience, that they may not escape from the bondage in which she would hold them.

If our sons are indeed to grow up as young plants, like our English oaks, which, according to the analogies of Nature, furnish no inappropriate type of our national character, they must not be stunted or dwarft or pollarded, for the sake of being kept under the shade of a stranger. They should grow up straight toward heaven, as God has ordained them to grow. That freedom of reason and conscience, that freedom of studying His word, which He granted to the whole people at our blessed Reformation, should be carefully, scrupulously, zealously preserved, as the most precious part of our national inheritance. Thus alone shall we act in unison with the true principles of our National Church, which, while it endeavours to lead the hearts and minds of its members in the way of truth, by pointing continually to the guides that have been set up in various ages to help us in discovering that way, yet never imposes her authority despotically upon them, but directs them in all things primarily to the one sure and infallible authority, the word of God. In these days, above all, is it needful that the minds of all, both the young and the old, should be continually directed to the same authority by those who are appointed to teach them. In ages of general ignorance, men may be persuaded to surrender their understandings blindfold to the dictation of a human authority. But when the darkness has once been broken, imperfect

and dim as the light may be,—when men have once tasted the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, though much of bitterness may be mixt with its sweetness, — above all, when, through God's bountiful dispensation, they have been allowed, one and all, each in his own house, by his own fireside, on his own sick-bed, to read His word freely, and to seek for help and instruction and comfort therein,—then,—although a few weak and morbid spirits may be disgusted by the medicinal bitterness of the fruit, and appalled by the perils of the privilege granted to them,—the bulk of the nation will resolutely resist every attempt to deprive them of the liberty they have enjoyed. Therefore, even if the voice of the New Testament were not so distinct in reprobating every kind of priestly usurpation, the conviction of its futility should deter us from attempting to encroach on the rights of our brethren. We must not set up our own authority, in place of that of God's word. This would be doing what our Church repeatedly disclaims and repudiates. In our teaching, while we teach as having authority, we should be studious at the same time to make it apparent that our authority proceeds solely from the word of God, to which all are to have access alike.

Let it not be objected that I am speaking in too lofty terms of the freedom granted by the Gospel to all adult members of the Church. Our Lord Himself has declared that the Truth is to make us *free*,—not slaves, not bondmen, whether to Rome, or to any other self-constituted authority, but free. Doubtless the most precious part of this evangelical freedom is that from our own sins and vices, and from our own wilfulness.

But it will also be a freedom, at least within the region of the spirit, from the sins and vices, the wilfulness and tyranny of other men, a freedom in which we shall be enabled to follow the bidding of our enlightened reason and conscience, without any let or hindrance, inward or outward. Manliness of character and of intellect is not at variance with godliness, but is its correlative in all our human relations. Now manliness has always been a distinguishing feature of our English character; and may it ever continue so to be! The Gospel does not repress or forbid it. He who truly fears God, is delivered thereby from every other fear: he will neither fear man nor devil. The oak is God's workmanship, no less than the reed: and Joshua and Gideon and David and Elijah and the sons of Thunder and St Paul stand among the foremost heroes in the kingdom of God. This manliness, in our human relations, our ordinary English education has fostered; and so far it has done good. Its defect has been, that it did not sufficiently foster and cultivate the only true, enduring ground of true manliness, the fear of God: which fear, when we know and feel that we are reconciled to God by His Son, loses its depressing character, and becomes elevating and ennobling, while we have a lively conviction and consciousness that we are not only permitted, but commanded, to come boldly to the Throne of Grace.

Here again we may find a type in trees. Indeed there is something so palpable and striking in this type, that five and twenty years ago, in speaking of the gentlemanly character, I was led to say, "If a gentleman is to grow up, he must grow like a tree: there

must be nothing between him and heaven." And now, after a quarter of a century, the same thought has been brought forcibly back to my mind by our text, when I look at it in connexion with the present circumstances of our Church. If our sons are to grow up as young plants, they should grow up as children of God, reconciled to Him by Christ, admitted into their Father's presence, without any mediation or intercession, except that of the One Mediator and Intercessor, who, while he was Man, was also God,—without any mediation or intercession of Saints, or of the Mother of our Lord, whom a corrupt, carnalminded Church, without any warrant, in defiance of the truth, has foisted in between man and God.

This is a matter of the utmost importance. For there is such a theophoby in the carnal heart and mind, such a shrinking from the thought of entering into God's presence, that man, in all nations, has caught eagerly at the notion of gaining an interest with some courtier or favorite, through whose influence he may propitiate the King of Heaven. This belief, which in a certain sense foreshadowed the true mediatorial intercession, is still welcomed by the carnal heart, although the truth foreshadowed by it has long ago been made manifest in the fulness of its glory. So too does the carnal heart still cling to the notion of priestly mediation and intercession, although this too was consummated and abolisht in the priesthood of our one perfect High-priest. Therefore, — because the carnal heart is so prone to embrace these errours, as we see exemplified down to this day in Heathen nations, the more corrupt of which are generally the most given up to such

superstitions, — therefore is it especially necessary to keep watch against every modification of these errours. Therefore is it our primary duty to lead our pupils in a simple, trustful faith to our one only Highpriest; which faith alone has power to deliver us from these superstitions. Therefore are we bound to inculcate continually upon our people, that we are their pastors or shepherds, and their ministers or servants, but that we have no priestly office, in the Jewish or Pagan sense of the word. Seeing that man is ever so ready to jump at a notion, which holds out the promise of relieving him from his own personal responsibility, we should studiously refrain from every act or word, which might encourage so delusive and mischievous an errour.

I will touch on one more point, before I conclude. The finest feature in the English character, in that character which even forein nations ascribe to Englishmen, is truth, the love of truth, and the strict adherence to it. I could not help feeling a glow of exultation the other day, when I found it stated by an English officer, who has been serving his country heroically in the North of India, that among some of the native tribes it is supposed that there is a peculiarity in the conformation of an Englishman's mouth, which makes it impossible for him to say what is false. A grander testimony to the character of a nation was never borne: and it is to this our truth, along with our manliness, which is its natural accompaniment, that God has granted our unparalleled empire. At the same time my exultation was dampt with shame to think how far we are from really deserving such praise. In comparison with other nations, at least with some others,

we may indeed have a considerable superiority: but in comparison with Him who is the Truth, our purest truth becomes deceitfulness and hypocrisy. Still, when we contrast the English as a body with that which is concurrently reported of our fellow-subjects on the other side of St George's Channel, while we cannot but perceive that there is a vast difference, we are led to infer that this difference is not unconnected with that between the forms of Christianity which prevail in the two countries: for, I believe, no such difference is found in the north of Ireland. Nor is it difficult to discern why this should be so. For while our Reformed Church calls upon us, in accordance with the practice of our Lord Himself and of His Apostles, to believe the truth, to believe that which the word of God declares to be the truth, to believe it because it is true, and to search and ascertain that it is so, the Church of Rome, on the contrary, commands her votaries to believe whatever she tells them, to believe it implicitly, without enquiry, without hesitation, on the sole ground that she bids them believe it: and she reprobates and peremptorily condemns every attempt to make out whether it is indeed true. Now he who brings himself thus to believe, or rather to make believe that he believes, without discerning any correspondence between the articles of his belief and the convictions of his reason, will naturally lose all conception of truth, as a thing certain, and worthy to be the object of pursuit through life and through death. Truth, in his eyes, becomes dependent on the dictum of a man, whom in the bottom of his heart he knows to be fallible, even as he knows him to be liable to all manner of sin, not excepting the

basest or the most atrocious, but who, he is told by his priest, is infallible, and whom therefore, under terrour of excommunication, he declares to be so. Now when this gross and flagrant imposture is placed at the root of his belief, the rest must needs partake more or less of its rottenness. There is an affinity too between the search after speculative truth, and the practical reverence for moral truth. Honesty, integrity, sincerity, singlemindedness are equally indispensable for both; and if they are not cultivated with reference to the former end, they will be at a disadvantage with reference to the latter.

Moreover truth in the heart and the mind is the correlative to that great primary doctrine, by the assertion of which the usurpation of Rome was cast down at the Reformation, that we are justified by faith, —that is, not by works, which, every man's heart must tell him, are so often factitious and delusive, but by a true, living, spiritual apprehension of Christ, the Eternal Son of God, as our Divine Mediator and Peacemaker, and of the Father, to whom we are brought nigh by Him. When we are rooted and grounded in this faith, we take our stand, as it were, in the sun, in the centre and fountain of light and truth; and we see all things in this pure light: we see the light of truth shining upon them. It is a significant fact, that some of the recent deserters from our Church have been fond of depreciating this virtue of Truth, as merely Pagan and rationalistic. They could hardly have given a more awful witness of the manner in which they have yielded themselves up to believe a lie, or rather a system and network of lies. They could hardly have shewn more

forcibly how incompatible their new belief,—for faith I will not call it,—is with truth and the love of it.

This therefore is another quality which ought to be cultivated with special care and diligence in these schools. We know that in the Anti-Reformation, by which Loyola and his disciples attempted to counteract the Reformation, the love of Truth has been studiously represt. Every notion was to be drawn, not from the thing itself, not from the object of that notion, but from authority. To question that authority, to seek after truth as independent of it, became a mortal sin. Let us take this example as a warning. Let us endeavour to cultivate the love of truth, of truth intellectual, and of truth moral, in every possible way. Let us set it before the mind as the one object of our intellectual life, as the one ground and safeguard of our moral life. In the Middle Classes this is especially needful in these times, because the thirst after gain, and the spirit of competition, which have lately been corrupting the trade of England, have beguiled so many of our tradesmen, whose character for honorable dealing formerly stood so high, into all manner of fraudulent tricks. Unless this spirit be checkt, unless these frauds be represt, the glory of England will wane and pass away. Let us bring up our sons as young plants, in the lively conviction that they are under the naked eye of heaven, and that God sees all their actions, and hears all their words, and reads all their thoughts; and they may be led hereby to seek earnestly after the inestimable grace of Truth.

Thus, if the aim of this School be to cultivate the moral graces in its pupils, especially those graces which

are the most congenial to our English nature, such as manliness or courage, and truth,—if it tries to bring them up as dutiful, loving members both of our Reformed Church and of our free State, — it will assuredly,—through God's help we may say, assuredly, —become a priceless blessing to England; and our next business will then be to render it the parent of like institutions in other parts of the land. Hereby too, while our sons grow up as plants, in loving fellowship, under the eye of Heaven, to form a loyal, dutiful, happy nation, we may further hope that through God's grace they may also be enabled to grow up in all things into Him who is the Head, even Christ the Lord, the Eternal, Onlybegotten Son of the Father.

THE END.

Lately publisht:

THE MISSION OF THE COMFORTER: Second Edition: 1850.

THE VICTORY OF FAITH: Second Edition: 1847.

SERMONS PREACHT IN HERSTMONCEUX CHURCH: 1841.
" " " Second Volume: 1849.

THE BETTER PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1840, with Notes.

PRIVILEGES IMPLY DUTIES: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1841, with Notes.

THE MEANS OF UNITY: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1842, with Notes, especially on the Anglican Bishopric at Jerusalem, and on the Need of an Ecclesiastical Synod.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN TIMES OF TRIAL: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1848, with Notes, especially on the Controversy touching the Management of Schools, and on the Jewish Question.

THE TRUE REMEDY FOR THE EVILS OF THE AGE: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1849, with Notes, especially on the Educational, Matrimonial, and Baptismal Questions.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH: a Sermon, with Introductory Remarks on Uniformity: 1845.

THE UNITY OF MANKIND IN GOD: a Sermon preacht on occasion of the Jubilee of the Church Missionary Society: 1848.

LETTER TO THE DEAN OF CHICHESTER, on the Appointment of Dr Hampden to the See of Hereford: Second Edition, with a Postscript, on Lord John Russell's Letter to the Clergy of Bedford, and in reply to Mr Trower's Plain Remarks: 1848.

THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOUR: a Letter to the Editor of the English Review: with a Letter from Professor Maurice to the Author: 1849.

LETTER TO THE HON. R. CAVENDISH, on the recent Judgement of the Court of Appeal, as affecting the Doctrine of the Church: Second Edition, with a Postscript: 1850.

A FEW WORDS ON THE REJECTION OF THE EPISCOPAL BILL TO AMEND THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURT OF APPEAL: 1850.

PORTIONS OF THE PSALMS IN ENGLISH VERSE, selected for Public Worship: 1839.

GUESSES AT TRUTH, by Two Brothers: First Series, Fourth Edition, revised: 1851.
Ditto Second Series, Second Edition, with large Additions: 1848.

Preparing for Publication:

THE CONTEST WITH ROME: a Charge delivered at the Visitation in 1851, with Notes.

A VINDICATION OF LUTHER AGAINST HIS RECENT ENGLISH ASSAILANTS: Second Edition, reprinted from the Notes to the Mission of the Comforter, revised, with Notes.

THE WANTS OF THE CHURCH:—ROMANIZING FALLACIES:—THE ROMANIZING TENDENCIES OF THE AGE: Three Charges delivered at the Visitations in 1843, 1845, 1846, with Notes.

NOTES TO THE VICTORY OF FAITH.

SERMONS PREACHT ON PARTICULAR OCCASIONS: Second Edition, with Notes.

GUESSES AT TRUTH, by Two Brothers: Third Series, enlarged.

LONDON:
Printed by SAMUEL BENTLEY and Co.,
Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

Date Due

FACULTY

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01249 8541